

00306

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
12 ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

13

14

15 VOLUME III

16

17 October 4, 2002

18 Masonic Hall

19 Cordova, Alaska

20 8:30 o'clock a.m.

21

22 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

23

24 Ralph Lohse, Chairman

25 Robert Churchill

26 Fred Elvsaa

27 Susan Wells

28

29 Regional Coordinator, Ann Wilkinson

00307

1 PROCEEDINGS

2

3 (Cordova, Alaska - 10/4/2002)

4

5 (On record)

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'd like to call this
8 fall meeting of the Southcentral Subsistence Regional
9 Advisory Council back in session. We are finished with
10 our proposals. We're going on to our other information
11 and other things. We're on number 11. I was going to
12 ask Hollis and Devi, is that a fairly long one, or is
13 that short one?

14

15 (No audible response)

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That'll be just a short
18 one. Then I think we'll take it in order. The next one
19 is 12 and I know Polly Wheeler has got to leave on an
20 11:00 o'clock plane so we'll go on to 12. And then I
21 think we'll probably skip over to, we'll let's see, I'm
22 looking for it. Oh, we'll probably skip over to 14
23 because some of the people in 14 have to leave at 11:00,
24 too. Then Bill will have to give his after they're done
25 with that. So, that's what I was laughing at, Bill. So,
26 anyhow, let's go on to 11 then, Hollis and Devi.

27

28 MS. SHARP: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

29

30 UNIDENTIFIED: He doesn't say good
31 morning.

32

33 MS. SHARP: And Council Members. I guess
34 the issue before us this morning is that the
35 representative from the Southcentral Regional Advisory
36 Council for the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource
37 Commission is Fred John, Jr. Freddy's not been showing
38 up to meetings, nor did he show up to our's, and our
39 Commission has asked to replace him. I have done some
40 homework and have some possibilities for people from Fish
41 and Wildlife Regional Advisory Council, is that what
42 they're called?

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fish and Game.

45

46 MS. SHARP: Fish and Game.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, Fish and Game
49 Advisory Committees.

50

00308

1 MS. SHARP: Fish and Game Advisory
2 Committees. And, if you'd like to, I'll give you their
3 names. One of them is Cole Ellis, he lives at Mile 42 on
4 the Nabesna Road in GMU12, of course it's out of this
5 area, born and raised in Alaska, living in Nabesna since
6 1960. Ollie Bates, Mile 1 of the Nabesna Road, he's in
7 13(C). These are the suggestions from the Slana group.

8
9 I also have some suggestions from the
10 Glennallen Group. And Bill Albaugh who lives on the Tok
11 cut-off, it's also GMU12. And then from the Copper Basin
12 Fish and Game Advisory Group, which might be more
13 appropriate for this Council because the other ones are
14 in Unit 12 and 13. I would highly recommend Fred
15 Williams. He's retired Fish and Game, very attentive to
16 issues in the community, and he is, I think he's their
17 Chair.

18
19 UNIDENTIFIED: Don Horrelle is the Chair.

20
21 MS. SHARP: Oh, is it? Don Horrelle is
22 the Chair? Don is already in our in our Subsistence
23 Resource Commission. But, there's a few people on the
24 Copper Basin list, I would need to do a little bit more
25 investigation, but there are a few people who I could
26 recommend, so I would like guidance on how to proceed.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Council, we have -- we
29 have -- this is for the seat that we have to appoint to
30 Southcentral Regional Advisory Committee. Do you think,
31 Devi, that you could put a list of names and -- how soon
32 does this have to be done?

33
34 MS. SHARP: There isn't.....

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, it doesn't have
37 to be done today?

38
39 MS. SHARP: No, it doesn't have to be
40 done today, and it's really not critical, we just would
41 like to replace Freddy if he's not going to show up.

42
43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

44
45 MS. SHARP: Because like everybody else,
46 we have those white knuckle moments on making a quorum,
47 and.....

48
49 UNIDENTIFIED: We wouldn't understand
50 that.

00309

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could you -- do you
2 think it would be more proper if what you would do is get
3 a list of names and their qualifications and get them to
4 us so we can act on them on our spring meeting, would
5 that work?

6

7 MS. SHARP: That sounds good. Yeah, I
8 wasn't prepared to do that because we had our
9 meeting.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

12

13 MS. SHARP:just 10 days ago, last
14 week.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we can recognize
17 the fact that.....

18

19 MS. SHARP: Right.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:you need to have
22 somebody that comes to your meetings. Bob?

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, being unfamiliar
25 with the process, however I was the Director of Human
26 Resources for 20 years, so I'd like to see a fair amount
27 of data, and then have an opportunity to discuss it
28 certainly with the Chair, but to get some the of the
29 local feeling. I know Don Horrelle well, I've worked
30 with him in the past, and he's.....

31

32 MS. SHARP: He's on our list here,
33 too.....

34

35 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah.

36

37 MS. SHARP:already.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: And maybe we could have a
40 process where we could work through the Chair and do some
41 development on these people. I like your sense of
42 caution and waiting until spring we can really look and
43 talk to the local folks.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think that would be
46 the best way to go about it.

47

48 MS. SHARP: Okay. I'm concerned -- this
49 is another topic, if you'll indulge me.

50

00310

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

2

3 MS. SHARP: I'm concerned that the
4 membership at the moment does not reflect the Copper
5 Basin. You've very short on Copper Basin representation.
6 I will -- I'm committed to next go around for nominations
7 for looking for people, good likely candidates for the
8 Regional Advisory Council, but it does concern me that
9 there is no one from the upper Copper Basin which is
10 still covered in the Southcentral responsibility.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, when you talk about
13 the upper Copper Basin, you're talking about Mentasta,
14 Slana, Gakona, that area?

15

16 MS. SHARP: Yes. You're as far up in
17 McCarthy and the Copper Basin as anybody, and there's
18 still another 13 million acres or something like that.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Now, the
21 appointments from Unit 12 will come from the east,
22 wouldn't they?

23

24 MS. SHARP: Yeah, they would. And I
25 realized that as I was pulling them out.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

28

29 MS. SHARP: So, it would have to be from
30 the Copper Basin Fish and Game Advisory Group.

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. Now, does it have
33 to be from Fish and Game Advisory Group?

34

35 MS. SHARP: It either needs to come, and
36 you can -- someone correct me if I'm wrong, but it either
37 needs to come from this Council right here, or you can
38 default to the Fish and Game Advisory groups.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

41

42 MS. SHARP: So, it could be you.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Could be, yeah.

45

46 MS. SHARP: It could be.

47

48 UNIDENTIFIED: Do you consider that a
49 threat?

50

00311

1 MS. SHARP: You would be a likely
2 candidate, but there isn't anybody else on the Council
3 that's.....

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: From that area.
6

7 MS. SHARP: Yeah, except for Fred John,
8 Jr.

9
10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Yeah, I think
11 you're right, but.....

12
13 MS. SHARP: I'm perfectly willing to do
14 the homework and present you.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Present us with
17 some.....

18
19 MS. SHARP: Yeah.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Present us with some
22 possibilities. I don't think this is something we could
23 -- you know, firstly, out of all the names you mentioned
24 the only one I know is Fred Williams, and I know him
25 well, and I've known him well for 30 some years.

26
27 MS. SHARP: Right.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And I would trust his
30 judgment and all the rest, but I think it would only be
31 fair if we have more names in front of us.

32
33 MS. SHARP: Okay.

34
35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

36
37 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I missed the last,
38 Cole, the first name you.....

39
40 MS. SHARP: Oh, it's Cole Ellis. He's
41 part of a large family.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Ellis?

44
45 MS. SHARP: Ellis.

46
47 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

48
49 MS. SHARP: He lives at the end of the
50 Nabesna Road.

00312

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, the Ellis's have
2 ties all over that whole section, so. Okay.

3
4 MS. SHARP: That's all I have.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's all you have,
7 thank you. Same dilemma, Hollis?

8
9 MR. TWITCHELL: Good morning, Chair,
10 Council Members. We have a similar sort of need for
11 either a reappointment or an appointment. Our charter
12 for Denali Subsistence Resource Commission recognizes two
13 members being appointed to our Commission by the
14 Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. That was a
15 decision the SRC made because of Campbell being one of
16 the larger residence owned communities, and they felt
17 they would like a little more representation from that
18 particular region.

19
20 One of the two member's terms of
21 appointment expires next month in November, and that's
22 Gilbert Dementi's position. The other member, Vernon
23 Carlson, is in good standing for another year yet and
24 then his appointment will come before you again.

25
26 So, today we're only asking for Gilbert
27 Dementi's position for you to consider either appointing,
28 reappointing him for another commission, or I have a name
29 of another candidate who has offered his name forward,
30 but only if Gilbert Dementi chooses not to serve or if
31 you choose not to reappoint him, and that individual is
32 Marty Carress. He's the Chair of the Denali Fish and
33 Game Advisory Committee.

34
35 This individual, he's been involved with
36 the Advisory Committee since it's inception, and has
37 served on that Committee throughout it's full service
38 life. He's been in Cantwell for 32 years, came there in
39 1970 full time. Prior to that he lived in the area off
40 and on from '61 to '64, so he has extensive experience in
41 that region and in Cantwell in particular. Retired from
42 the State after 26 years of service with them. He's an
43 active hunter, trapper, fisherman, photographer, and
44 skier. So, he has agreed that if Gilbert does not choose
45 to serve, or if you wish to appoint another person, that
46 he would act in that capacity.

47
48 I've also asked him for any other names
49 to consider, to advance. He had two names; Ray Govel and
50 Paul Miller. Neither of those individuals has he spoken

00313

1 to directly to determine whether they would be willing to
2 serve, but he thought that they may have some interest in
3 subsistence related issues as well as their activity on
4 the Fish and Game Advisory Committee. So he has reserved
5 those names and requested me not to advance them at this
6 point until he has had an opportunity to speak more
7 directly with them.

8

9 I tried to reach Gilbert, he's out on his
10 work assignment and he's not readily accessible. The
11 last time we spoke a number of months ago he was willing
12 and intended to continue to serve if he was reappointed.
13 I did call Eleanor a couple of days ago, or yesterday, in
14 the hopes of getting a hold of Gilbert and she reassured
15 me that, yes, he would be interested to serve. So, that
16 comes from his wife, so, we know how important that is.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: She'd be willing to let
19 him serve.

20

21 MR. TWITCHELL: Yes. So, Gilbert, in his
22 last terms of appointment has, I think, missed a couple
23 of meetings and they've all been associated with not
24 being able to get time off from his work at the pump
25 station. So, he has attendance, and he is a contributor,
26 and we considered him a valuable member of the Commission
27 over his years of service there. So, at that, from the
28 Park Service's standpoint, we would encourage and support
29 his reappointment. Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Council.

32

33 MR. ELVSAAS: How often does the
34 Commission meet? You said he missed a couple, I'm
35 curious as to how often you meet.

36

37 MR. TWITCHELL: We meet twice a year,
38 usually in August and again in February with the
39 intentions of meeting prior to the Council meeting cycles
40 so that the Commission will have an opportunity to
41 advance their concerns and comments to the Commission,
42 the Councils, and the Board.

43

44 This last August was the first time in 19
45 years we were unable to receive a quorum, which is pretty
46 unusual for our Commission, and we're a pretty active and
47 pretty dedicated group of people. And that was due to
48 weather and a number of work and employment situations
49 where employees couldn't get the time off, so, we called
50 that meeting. But, twice a year on those cycles at a

00314

1 minimum, and then if there's a real major issue we'll
2 often call a meeting in addition to that, but normally
3 twice a year.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: My feeling would be to
6 reappoint Gilbert if he is willing to take the position,
7 with a directive from us, and I know he is very
8 knowledgeable of that area up there. So, Bob?

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I mean with all due
11 respect, I agree. You know, we've had testimony, he's a
12 valued member, he attends, when -- the only time he
13 doesn't is when it's for reasons beyond his control, he
14 makes valuable contributions and stays in touch. I think
15 that's about as good as it gets, and then when you have
16 the Chair of the local AC deferring, and the message I'm
17 getting, would like to also see him stay there, I don't
18 think it gets much better than that. I agree, I think he
19 should be reappointed.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And then if he does not
22 accept the position then we could appoint the other
23 individual you were talking about, but I think at this
24 time I'm trying to get a motion on the table to reappoint
25 Gilbert for.....

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Some.....

28

29 MR. TWITCHELL: I just wanted to add that
30 Gilbert has good associations with the Copper River
31 Native Association and I know he works through them, so
32 that's a good partnership from that standpoint. Vernon
33 Carlson serves on the Denali Fish and Game Advisory
34 Committee, so he provides a good liaison between the
35 Commission and that particular Committee, so I believe
36 we're pretty well covered in that area.

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved that we
41 reappoint Gilbert to Denali SRC.

42

43 MS. WELLS: And I second.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Seconded. The move was
46 seconded. Any discussion.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Question's been called.

00315

1 All in favor signify by saying aye.

2

3 IN UNISON: Aye.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
6 saying nay. Nay. I mean not nay. I mean, I did not say
7 nay. I said it but I didn't mean it.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: What's this voting twice
10 thing, I don't know.

11

12 (No opposing votes).

13

14 UNIDENTIFIED: You're getting their
15 attention.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's early in the
18 morning. Okay, we're going to go on to subsistence
19 resource -- we're going to go on to the Fisheries
20 Resource Monitoring Programs. Doug McBride, Polly
21 Wheeler. Now, let's see, we need to get which booklet
22 this time? The yellow one, I think. Doug.

23

24 MR. MCBRIDE: Good morning Mr. Chairman,
25 members of the Council. My name is Doug McBride, I'm
26 with the Office of Subsistence Management Fishery
27 Information Services, and with me I'm sure you all know,
28 is Polly Wheeler with the same organization. Just as a
29 matter of very brief introduction, I'm a fishery
30 biologist, I've certainly addressed this Council before,
31 and for the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program, there's
32 several fishery biologists in our office and we have
33 geographic responsibilities. So in terms of
34 administering the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program my
35 responsibility is the what we call the Cook Inlet Gulf of
36 Alaska Area, Southcentral Area, this area, and Southeast
37 Alaska. And of course, Polly is our staff anthropologist
38 and she covers the harvest monitoring and TEK portion of
39 the program statewide. So, we're both here to address
40 you on several matters here this morning.

41

42 We actually have two presentations that
43 we'd like to split up. The first one is for the draft
44 Fishery Resource Monitoring Program in fiscal year 2003,
45 so this upcoming year. And what we're going to bring to
46 you is a recommendation for funding in 2003. We have a
47 brief presentation on that. And then following that will
48 be a second presentation looking at issues and
49 information needs for the subsequent fiscal year in
50 fiscal year 2004.

00316

1 So, we prepared a couple of handouts.
2 There's one, hopefully doesn't look quite this beat up,
3 the folks in Southeast were really rough on us. But, at
4 any rate, this more very yellowish handout are the
5 talking points. However, for anybody that doesn't have
6 them this will totally be following along with the
7 material that is under tab F in your book. So, if you
8 just -- in that yellow handout -- and like I said, these
9 are just the talking points that I'll be speaking to in
10 tab F.

11
12 Again, the purpose of this presentation
13 is to summarize the information that is in tab F. This
14 is about funding recommendations for this fiscal year
15 that we just started here in the last couple of days and
16 following our presentation we would very much like review
17 and comment on the draft plan, and recommendations from
18 this Council.

19
20 If you go to the third page in that
21 handout, this is just a very brief agenda of what I'll be
22 covering in the next -- or Polly and I will be covering
23 in the next couple of minutes. We'll spend just a couple
24 of minutes on the background of the Fishery Resource
25 Monitoring Program, we'll very quickly cover the study
26 selection process, and then we'll get right into the
27 recommendations, and then open it up for questions and
28 discussion.

29
30 So, on the fourth page is a graph that
31 looks like this. This is the same graph that's on page
32 223 of the Council book. In fact, in a lot of respects
33 you might be better off looking at page 223 because this
34 didn't Xerox all that well. And what this is a graph of
35 is the finances statewide of the Fishery Resource
36 Monitoring Program. And so along the horizontal axis,
37 the bottom axis, are the years going from 2000 out to
38 2004, and then the vertical axis is money in millions of
39 dollars.

40
41 And, there's just a couple of things that
42 we want to point out there. What you can see is that the
43 program was initiated in the year 2000 and those dark
44 bars, particularly if you look at the graph on page 223,
45 you see those very dark bars at the bottom, that was the
46 three years of the initial installment of the Fishery
47 Resource Monitoring Program. And I think the important
48 thing to note there is those dark bars end in 2002. So,
49 we have now completed the first installment of the
50 Fishery Resource Monitoring Program and any financial

00317

1 commitments that were made in the very first year of the
2 program are now completed.

3

4 Then, if you go to that largest bar on
5 there on 2001 you'll see that one real large segment,
6 that was the 2001 installment, that was the really the
7 full financial weight of the program, 7.25 million
8 dollars. I know several of you were at the Council when
9 we had that big Council meeting in February of 2001 where
10 we brought all the Council's in, that was that
11 installment of the program, and that was really the, like
12 I say, that was the full financial weight of the program
13 that was initiated in 2001.

14

15 And so, as we look forward to 2003 we
16 still have obligations from that installment in 2001,
17 that's what that very bottom part of the graph in 2003
18 is, is the third year of programs. And you need to
19 remember the way we administer this program we allow
20 proposals up to three years in duration, okay.

21

22 If you move over to 2002, like I say,
23 you'll see the third year of the obligations from the
24 2000 program at the bottom, then the next part of that
25 graph is the second year of the 2001 program, then the
26 third part was the program that we deliberated on last
27 fall, that was the intention of the 2002 installment.

28

29 And so, now what I would like you to
30 focus your attention on is as you move over to 2003, I
31 won't go through all the various segments of that bar,
32 what I want to focus on is the very top part that has a
33 number in it, 1,827. That's one million eight hundred
34 and twenty seven thousand dollars. That's how much money
35 we have for new programs in 2003. Now, that's statewide,
36 but that's our financial target on a statewide basis for
37 2003, and it's the smallest amount of money we've had
38 since the initiation of the program. And the reason for
39 that is the total amount of money in the program remains
40 constant at 7.25 million dollars annually, but the way we
41 calculate how much money is available in any particular
42 year is you take the total and you have to subtract all
43 the prior obligations. So, in 2003 we have lots of prior
44 obligations from particularly 2001 and to some extent
45 2002.

46

47 So, at any rate that's the amount of
48 money statewide that we have, and I think if you remember
49 right in the terms of the way this program is
50 administered, there's a funding formula that breaks the

00318

1 money up -- I'm sorry -- breaks the money out regionally,
2 those dollar amounts are set by the Board. And so, we
3 actually get into the program we'll get into the amount
4 of money that's available for this region, but the
5 pattern in each region is identical. You have a
6 relatively small amount of money to initiate new work in
7 2003.

8

9 The only other thing that I want to mention is in
10 terms of background. Because the amount of money was
11 relatively small in 2003, when we went out for the call
12 for proposals last November, we did some things
13 differently than we had done in the past, and there are
14 really two things that we did. Because for the first
15 time in 2003 we were bumping up against the issue of what
16 we call continuation projects. The year 2001, the final
17 installment of that was last year in 2002. There are
18 some programs that we recognize that even though the
19 three year financial obligation is completed, the
20 programs were clearly intended to go on longer than three
21 years. So, for the very first time we had to deal with
22 the issue, if you will, or the question of which ones of
23 those programs makes sense to continue on into the
24 future. So we put that in our offer proposals.

25

26 And what we did with those programs was
27 anything that was billed as a continuation project we
28 only allowed them to submit a proposal for a single year,
29 just for one year, and we, I'll get into this later in
30 the second presentation, but we were doing that so that
31 we could kind of clear the decks financially, if you
32 will, for 2004. And we'll get into the 2004 stuff in a
33 few minutes. But we only allowed one year, and then we,
34 to be honest, made a big deal, but we didn't have that
35 much money because what we didn't want to have was a
36 repeat of what happened in 2002.

37

38 In 2002 we had about 13 million dollars
39 worth of proposals submitted for a little over 2 million
40 dollars in available funding. And it just generates an
41 incredible amount of work, but more importantly I think
42 is it generates some false expectations on the part of
43 the investigators. I mean, they're turning in literally
44 millions and millions of dollars worth of proposals when
45 we only have two million dollars to spend. So, we made
46 it very obvious how much money we had to spend and so the
47 amount of proposals that was submitted came down
48 commensurately for this year.

49

50 If you turn the page then in the handout,

00319

1 go back to the agenda, what I'd like to do now is just
2 very briefly address our study selection process, and
3 moving on to the next page. Again, I think most of you
4 have been through this before so I'll cover this very
5 quickly. The oversight for this program is done by the
6 FIS Staff, which is part of the Office of Subsistence
7 Management. The recommendations, all the evaluation of
8 these projects and the recommendations are made by what
9 we call the Interagency Technical Review Committee and it
10 is exactly what it sounds like. In fact, there are
11 several members of what we call the TRC in the audience
12 here today. But they're agency technical representatives
13 that review these projects along with the FIS Staff.

14
15 And their review is based on four
16 criteria, and that's what's at the bottom of that page.
17 The projects are evaluated on strategic priorities, and
18 so what that means is how well do they really -- do they
19 meet the Council's issues and information needs. They're
20 based on technical and scientific merit. Basically are
21 they technically competent programs for what they set out
22 to do. The third criteria is the past performance of the
23 investigators, are they, you know, do they have a stellar
24 track record, or in a few cases were there issues with
25 performance in the past, but we look at that. And then
26 the final one is the partnership and capacity building.
27 So, that's how well the projects seek to address capacity
28 building within rural and Tribal organizations. So our
29 evaluation, if you will, is based on those four criteria.

30
31
32 Okay, so just going back to the agenda
33 now, like I say, what I'd like to do now is present what
34 was on the table and then our recommendations for 2003.
35 Just a real brief summary of your issues and information
36 needs, those are updated at each Council meeting. In
37 fact, the next presentation will be talking about that
38 for 2004, but the issues and information needs that we
39 had in front in of us for 2003 are best summarized as
40 development of subsistence fishery regulations for Cook
41 Inlet, and that's kind of a separate issue that we'll
42 talk about in our presentation. Then improvement of
43 assessment of Copper River fish stocks, particularly
44 chinook, sockeye, burbot, and steelhead. And then
45 further documentation of subsistence harvest use
46 patterns.

47
48 When you go through the funding formula
49 of what was available for this region in 2003 statewide,
50 it was about 1.8 million. The Cook Inlet Gulf of Alaska

00320

1 section of that was about \$219,000. So that was our
2 target dollar amount that we were aiming at in terms of
3 this recommendation, and also our recommendation. Our
4 starting point for our recommendation is based on a
5 balance of two thirds of what we call stock status and
6 trends projects, which is stock assessment type of work,
7 and then one for what we call harvest monitoring and TEK
8 projects. So that's our starting point for our
9 recommendation to you.

10

11 So, if you turn the page, and this is
12 identical, but there's a table, and this is the same
13 table that's on page 231 of the Council book. This is
14 what was available and what was recommended for the stock
15 status and trends projects. And actually for this year
16 it's very straight forward and simple. There were two
17 projects that were advanced for development of an
18 investigation plan and they are the abundance and run
19 timing of adult salmon. That's not supposed to be Tana
20 Creek, that's Tanada Creek, which is small tributary on
21 the Copper River up by the Batzulnetas Subsistence
22 Fishery. And that by the way is a continuation project.
23 That project was first funded in 2000 in the original
24 installment for this program, and the funding obligation
25 expired, so that was submitted. And then there was a
26 second project, stock assessment of salmon in Shrode Lake
27 and Billy's Hole and Prince William Sound.

28

29 I'll just very briefly go through our
30 recommendations. Our recommendations are very straight
31 forward. We're recommending funding both of those
32 projects. The easiest one is Tanada Creek, I say, that's
33 a weir project on Tanada Creek. It has very direct
34 application to management not only of the Copper River in
35 total, but of the Batzulnetas Fishery in particular.
36 After the first year a floating weir was installed in
37 that creek. It's operating very, very well. It has some
38 other components to it in terms of assessing what's going
39 on up in the lake itself, but it's technically a very
40 good project. It's been operating very well. It was
41 submitted for continuation funding. In our view it makes
42 a lot of sense to continue that project. So we're
43 recommending funding that for an additional year, and
44 that's what you see in front of you.

45

46 The second project, that 03-033, even
47 though this is a new project, it's one that we've seen
48 actually every year since 2001 and this is a very similar
49 kind of project to Tanada Creek. It's a stock assessment
50 project for a couple of small sockeye stocks in Prince

00321

1 William Sound and the two locations are Billy's Hole and
2 Shrode Lake. The TRC recommendation is to only fund the
3 Billy's Hole portion of this project. And we made that
4 recommendation for two reason. First is just straight
5 financial. The project is a fair amount of money, but
6 when you look at how much money is available for this
7 region and in this data type, we needed to make some kind
8 of a recommendation to try to pull this in closer to the
9 financial target. But then the second reason really has
10 to do with strategic priorities. When you look at those
11 two locations, Billy's Hole, from a subsistence
12 prospective is much more important to our knowledge than
13 Shrode Lake. In fact, I spoke with Patty and Ron
14 Schwallenberg yesterday evening about this and I believe
15 there is a letter of support from Tatitlek that speaks to
16 that very issue, that Billy's Hole is really -- you know,
17 if you've got to choose between the two that's the one to
18 hone in on. So, our recommendation for the stock status
19 and trends part of this is to fund both projects, but
20 only fund the Billy's Hole portion of the Prince William
21 Sound project.

22

23 Just one other aside and we'll move on to
24 the harvest monitoring TEK, for the Shrode Lake, that's
25 not to say Shrode Lake wouldn't be a good idea, but our
26 -- the TRC recommendation is for the Forest Service,
27 through some other funding sources, to consider funding
28 for that. And they are considering that, but that
29 project wouldn't even start until FY 2004. So, I spoke
30 to Forest Service staff about that. They are certainly
31 going to consider that but it's, you know, it's just,
32 there's just not a point in their budget process to make
33 a call on that at this point. So, with that I'll turn
34 the presentation over to Polly.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I understand right on
37 this one here when I'm looking at that graph that the
38 Billy's Hole portion is
39 -- no, that's not right. Okay. So, there isn't any
40 break out what the modification would end up costing
41 then, is there, on that graph on 231?

42

43 MR. MCBRIDE: The amount of money in the
44 tables, so where it says yes with modification, then you
45 see 163.2 and then 79.7, that is the Billy's Hole portion
46 of the project. It would be a two year project. That is
47 the cost. The reason it's high in the first year is that
48 they had build the weir and install it. So there's a
49 capital cost, if you will, of the materials, and the
50 construction, and that kind of stuff. And then it would

00322

1 be built and operated the first year, operate the second
2 year. Then the Shrode Lake part of it is that footnote.
3 And what that would do is, if Shrode Lake was included,
4 then that 79.7 in the second year of the project would in
5 fact go up to 137.6. So that's the difference between
6 the two projects if you added Shrode Lake. And then
7 there'd be a third year in FY '05, and it would be 123.7.
8 So, that's how the funding would break out.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, so Shrode Lake
11 wouldn't come on line until the second year?

12

13 MR. MCBRIDE: Exactly.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How big of streams are
16 these?

17

18 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I've not been
19 on the grounds in either place, but they are relatively
20 small. These are small systems in Prince William Sound,
21 but they have lakes. What the issue is is rain. Even
22 though they are small they flood and so you need a fairly
23 skoozum structure to deal with that.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It just seems like an
26 awful lot to spend to build a weir and have somebody
27 watch it for the summer. When I think of what Cliff has
28 done at Long Lake for 30 years it's hard to think that
29 you have to spend \$163 -- \$163,000 to put a weir across a
30 small creek and count the fish into it. It just -- maybe
31 we ought to tell Cliff that that's what he's worth every
32 year. He counted almost 49,000 fish in this summer. Mr.
33 Churchill.

34

35 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a couple questions.
36 On this Tanada, am I pronouncing that correctly?

37

38 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes.

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: Are we still at the just
41 data gathering phase in that, or do we have information
42 we are applying and using kind of, I guess, where are we
43 at on that?

44

45 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Churchill, I'd say
46 we're in the data gathering phase. There's some sporadic
47 escapement estimates for Tanada Creek in the past, I
48 mean, it was done very sporadically at various points
49 over probably the last 20 years or so. Run size in
50 Tanada Creek very dramatically -- Eric Veach is here,

00323

1 he's actually the project biologist for that, but the
2 data I remember is, I mean the sockeye statement can vary
3 by about an order of magnitude anywhere from a couple
4 thousand up to, you know, in excess of 20,000, something
5 like that.

6

7 The point of the project is a couple
8 things, like I say, to get annual estimates of escapement
9 into a small tributary stream of the Copper River. If
10 you think about the Copper River Assessment Program, I
11 think we have some or we're developing some pretty good
12 main stem assessment programs for both sockeye, king
13 salmon, there's the Mile's Lake sonar which Fish and Game
14 runs, there's the chinook tagging project, which we fund
15 through the Native Village of Eyak, which is the fish
16 wheel capture program. There's a low river sonar program
17 which is getting early assessment of sockeye. But that's
18 looking at the total amount of fish moving up the Copper
19 River. There are really only a couple of tributary
20 assessment projects. Ralph with the one at Long Lake,
21 there's a brand new one that's going to be going in by
22 Fish and Game in the Gulkana River, and really this one.
23 There's some aerial surveys and stuff, but in terms of on
24 the grounds, getting some total estimates, this is one of
25 the few. So, we think this is a very good idea to
26 continue funding.

27

28 In addition to just the basic weir work
29 there's some lake assessment work which is going to be
30 happening that is part of this project and the whole idea
31 of that is to try to figure out what is the carrying
32 capacity of the lake, if you will, to rear juvenile
33 sockeyes, and that's going to hopefully help, you know,
34 give us a good idea of what an appropriate escapement
35 goal might be like. So, when this is all said and done
36 it should give us a means of estimating what the
37 escapement goal ought to be and then the means to deliver
38 that escapement or at least measure it.

39

40 MR. CHURCHILL: So, that's the objective
41 of the exercise?

42

43 MR. MCBRIDE: Correct.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: The same kind of
46 information -- is Billy's Hole just starting then, I
47 mean, it sounds like it, we're just starting that
48 project?

49

50 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes. And for a place like

00324

1 Billy's Hole there basically is no escapement assessment
2 information, none. And the idea here is not to have that
3 be an ongoing project forever. The idea of this is to go
4 in for just a couple years and just get a snapshot.
5 What's really going up into that system, is it a couple
6 hundred, a couple thousand, ten thousand, you know, just
7 figure out what is really going into that system. But, I
8 think the intent on this project would be to go in and
9 get a two year snapshot, and unless we saw something that
10 looked like a horrendous problem, basically back off.
11 And then have a point, you know, a kind of baseline point
12 where on into the future, you know, subsequent
13 investigators, you know, perhaps 10 years from now could
14 go in, do a similar kind of program, and then have some
15 basis of comparison to see whether, you know, what was
16 going on in that system. We would view the long term
17 prognosis for that system in terms of assessment
18 differently than we would for, say, Tanada Creek.

19
20 MR. CHURCHILL: So, I ask to contrast
21 then, Tanada Creek is more of a long term trend health of
22 the system and data your going to use, and Billy's Hole
23 is merely to establish a baseline sort of thing, as you
24 characterize it, a snapshot, that if we go back 10 years
25 from now we can maybe draw some conclusions from it.
26 Thank you.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, the only thing I
29 that I can see on that is when I look at the
30 communication from Tatitlek and their concerns concerning
31 Billy's Hole, you know, it doesn't appear that it can be
32 a short term project because, first of all we don't have
33 any data to start off with so we don't even have a
34 starting point. Second of all, it says they're concern
35 over the Billy's Hole stock is it is a village sustained
36 subsistence fishery and a new recreational fishery that's
37 developing on it over the past few years, more
38 recreational fishers have become aware of this harvest
39 area and are interested in learning more about this stock
40 including harvest levels, other users, population
41 escapement information, the overall goal is to set a
42 harvest level that is based on current biological
43 information to ensure the continuance of this fishery.

44
45 A snapshot doesn't do that. I mean a
46 snapshot doesn't give you any of that kind of information
47 that you're talking about, it doesn't address any of the
48 concerns that they're talking about. And as we've seen
49 at Long Lake, if you'd have picked two years, you could
50 have had two years and said, oh, the escapement in Long

00325

1 Lake is five to 8,000 fish, or you could have picked two
2 years and said, oh, the escapement into Long Lake is 46 -
3 48,000, you know. And it really doesn't, you know, that
4 kind of snapshot doesn't give us any kind of a baseline
5 to even, you know, it doesn't -- all it does is it says,
6 in 2001 and 2002 and 2003 and 2004 this many fish went
7 through. It doesn't say that there's any -- it doesn't
8 address is this run being sustained despite increased
9 pressure on it, is this run even capable of having any
10 pressure on it?

11

12 I mean, there's years you could have gone
13 into Long Lake and said, wow, you know, commercial
14 fishery has just wiped this run out, there's only 5,000
15 fish escaped here. And there's other years you'd say,
16 like this year, you'd say, wow, they must not have fished
17 on it, there's, you know, what's this lake going to do
18 with 50,000 fish in it? And there'll be 50,000 fish in
19 it at the end of the season.

20

21 So, I guess what I'm saying is, and
22 that's why when I look at the cost here, this kind of
23 thing to me, just like what we're doing in Tanada Creek,
24 only has value if it extends over a long enough period of
25 time to give us some kind of a feel for the system.
26 Tanada Creek is a very important system. I mean, it is
27 the Mentasta escape lake, I mean, it basically supports
28 their fishery up there. What we need is trends on that
29 one, you know. Is it maintaining a level of fish
30 production, is the fish production dropping to nothing,
31 is there something wrong in the system, what's changing
32 in the system? And the same thing would be true here.

33

34 I mean, I guess I have problems spending
35 \$163,000 to get a two year picture of escapement that
36 means nothing. Now, how can you take that \$163,000, do a
37 more low cost project, and get a picture that says, you
38 know, in 10 years this is what happens? I mean, that's
39 the kind of stock assessment that we need to be shooting
40 for. And I'm not objecting to this, but I'm just saying
41 it just doesn't appear to answer what they're putting
42 down as their needs and the cost appears to be awful high
43 for just getting information that has nothing to tie it
44 to. So, can you answer that, please?

45

46 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I'll try to.
47 And we share your concerns and issues exactly. From the
48 prospective of the agencies, and fishery managers and
49 researchers, a long term data set is infinitely more
50 valuable than just a snapshot. That would certainly, you

00326

1 know, if money were not an issue, that would be our
2 preference, no question about that.

3

4 I guess just a couple of comments about this
5 project and how it fits in with strategic priorities of
6 the Council. One of the things I should have mentioned
7 about the project is it also includes an on site
8 assessment of harvest of what's going on, both
9 subsistence and sport harvest, you know, in the
10 immediately local vicinity, you know, in the immediate
11 fishery. And, so, what we should get out of a snapshot
12 is not only an estimate of escapement, but also a very
13 good estimate of how much harvest is going on in the
14 terminal area and so we can scale harvest, you know,
15 versus escapement to see whether something looks
16 seriously out of whack. I mean, that's part of what we
17 do when we do kind of a more snapshot approach. So,
18 it'll be more than just the estimate of escapement. So,
19 there is that.

20

21 But then, again, just looking on into the
22 future, I guess a couple things, and this kind of gets
23 into the subsequent presentation. The Council has never
24 addressed how the relative importance of Prince William
25 Sound issues. We're, to a little bit of an extent, we're
26 kind of shooting in the dark from our perspective of
27 what's the strategic priority. And that's one of the
28 things we're going to ask you to do, is to address
29 relatively how important is Prince William Sound issues
30 in comparison to say, the Copper River issues. And as we
31 move on into the future I think what we're going to have
32 in front of us are some choices to make and the money is
33 going to dictate that we can't fund everything. By the
34 time FY 04 rolls around and certainly in FY 05, we're
35 going to be looking at, I think, making choices between,
36 you know, Copper River projects and Prince William Sound
37 projects. And, you know, in a couple of years,
38 collectively, we may see this differently. We may see
39 this as an important thing to continue on.

40

41 And I guess the only other thing that I'd
42 throw out is that right now, this, even with the
43 modification, this is a proposal completely to this
44 program. One of the things that we have been stressing
45 with the investigators is to bring in some kind of a
46 financial partnership. It makes for a much stronger
47 proposal, if you will, a much more compelling proposal if
48 they come back with a proposal that says, okay, here's
49 the total cost of the project and we're asking you to
50 fund this portion of it, and then we're working on some

00327

1 other funding source and we're going to get them to fund,
2 you know, it's more bang for the buck, it's stretching
3 the dollars. However you want to portray it. And so, as
4 we move on into the future that's one of the things we're
5 trying to push as hard as we can on, is to get people to
6 bring proposals to the table that represent cost share so
7 that we can stretch our dollars further and not have to
8 make as many, you know, choices I think we would have to
9 make if all we had to deal with was our funding source.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

12

13 MR. ELVSAAS: Thank you. I'm not
14 familiar with this area, Billy's Hole. Is it a salt
15 water cove, or is it a fishing hole along a stream, or is
16 there commercial fishing in this Billy's Hole?

17

18 MR. MCBRIDE: Billy's Hole is the name of
19 a system, it's a lake stream system in the Tatitlek
20 vicinity. And so it's just a single sockeye system
21 that's in the area. It's a place that the people from
22 Tatitlek to go to harvest sockeye, and I'm almost sure
23 that, you know, what they do is they gillnet, you know,
24 in the waters immediately in front of Billy's Hole. I
25 say there's some level of sport fishing that goes on
26 there, probably in the marine waters right where the
27 creek comes into Prince William Sound, perhaps to some
28 degree in the creek itself or the lake, I don't know.
29 That's part of what this project would figure out.

30

31 MR. ELVSAAS: So, it's a tidewater area
32 leading up to this lake?

33

34 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes.

35

36 MR. ELVSAAS: The Fish and Game, the
37 State should have some assessment of it due to the
38 commercial openings, and so forth, of what they expect
39 for escapement in the lake. Maybe they have some
40 information that might help you there to get some past
41 data and see what they've done. Certainly there are
42 flights and so forth checking streams and what not for
43 commercial openings that would be something of importance
44 there. I don't know if it's a real small stream, maybe
45 they don't bother with it, but on the other hand it
46 sounds to me like it is fairly important to the Village
47 of Tatitlek.

48

49 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Elvsaas, the short
50 answer is yes, I think it is very important to the

00328

1 Village of Tatitlek from the perspective of commercial
2 fishing management. And like I said, there's ADF&G
3 people there, which I don't want to completely speak for
4 them, but, I mean, when you read through the
5 investigation plan there is basically no historical
6 escapement information. All the surveys that they are
7 flying are directed at pink salmon assessment primarily.
8 And of course these are sockeyes moving up into a lake,
9 so they're timing wise to some extent and certainly
10 geographic wise they're kind of in a different place.
11 I've never been to Billy's Hole, but my guess is it's
12 probably hard to assess from the air. So, the
13 investigators looked into just what you're saying and
14 there really is no historic, very little or no historic
15 statement information for this system.

16

17 MR. ELVSAAS: So, it's not large enough
18 then to target for commercial fishing?

19

20 MR. MCBRIDE: No.

21

22 MR. ELVSAAS: Okay, thanks.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: What is the approximate
25 cost of putting the weir in, just ballpark? I mean, I
26 know the total project was 163.2, but what do you figure
27 the cost of just putting the weir in will be?

28

29 MR. MCBRIDE: Well, it would be about the
30 difference between the first year and second year costs
31 there, so whatever. Probably about 80,000. But by the
32 time you buy the materials, construct the weir, pay
33 somebody to construct the weir, and transport it, which
34 is going to be a huge thing in that part of the world,
35 that's very much in line with what I've seen as other
36 weir costs, particularly in remote locations. This cost
37 doesn't surprise me at all.

38

39 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I build post
40 offices all over the state, I know exactly what you're
41 talking about. And the rest of it would be basically
42 wage and to go to support the data gathering or
43 approximately 75-80,000?

44

45 MR. MCBRIDE: Correct, and on that score,
46 this is a cooperative project between Fish and Game and
47 the Village of Tatitlek, and so the seasonal personnel
48 for operating the weir would be coming from the village.

49

50 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

00329

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug, I was going to ask
2 one question in line with what Mr. Churchill asked.
3 Under your technical review, do you do a technical, I
4 guess I wouldn't say technical review, but do you a
5 review of cost estimates and that as to are they in line,
6 could this be done cheaper, I mean, is the cost of doing
7 it -- see, now, a lot of things that you just said, you
8 know, I just can't see how they apply. You can drive a
9 boat right to it, you know, you can haul stuff from town,
10 you can get construction site in, it's a small stream.
11 It just amazes me that it would cost basically \$100,000
12 to put a weir across a small stream, even if you had to
13 put it down where the tidal is, it just -- I think I'm in
14 the wrong business. I think I should start hiring out to
15 go build weirs because it just -- anyhow, but that's all
16 been reviewed, and in the opinion of the people that
17 reviewed it, it can't be done any cheaper?

18
19 MR. MCBRIDE: The short answer is yes.
20 Part of the investigation plan is they provided a
21 detailed budget and we've looked at that. We've looked
22 at all of them. And, is it expensive, yes. But is it
23 reasonable, yes.

24
25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think of some of the
26 things my kids have built in the water system and stuff
27 like that, and it's a weird weir.

28
29 MR. MCBRIDE: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I could get my kids
32 hired out to do this kind of stuff.

33
34 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

37
38 MR. MCBRIDE: There's also the cost of
39 installing a camp.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

42
43 MR. MCBRIDE: I mean, you know, people
44 have to live, and so, I mean, they're starting from
45 scratch. It's a brand new site, so there's going to be
46 a, you know, probably a wall tent with a platform, you
47 know, a stove, a propane refrigerator, I mean, it's
48 just.....

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

00330

1 MR. MCBRIDE: It's the cost to adopt the
2 site.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I guess it just seems
5 amazing to me that would, you know, the other thing is it
6 always seems amazing to me that when people are
7 interested in an area and it has a direct impact on them
8 that, you know, that that interest and that impact
9 doesn't translate into, you know, cutting the costs down
10 to a certain extent. I mean, it just, and I guess I'm
11 spoiled because I've been around people who have had
12 interests in it and have been willing to, you know, cut
13 costs down and do things for -- basically do things for
14 nothing just because they want to find out what's going
15 on there.

16
17 And, anyhow, I'll shut up, but it just, I
18 just seems to me like we could stretch our buck a lot
19 further instead of saying let's go Cadillac, we'd all say
20 let's go Chevy, and our goal in every one of these
21 projects was not how much money can we spend, but how
22 cheap can we do this and still get the information and
23 how many, you know, I think of the Parks, the Forest
24 Service and their volunteer effort to build trails and
25 stuff like that. I think of college kids and other
26 people who would be more than willing to do some
27 volunteer look for something like that, and some of that
28 kind of stuff should be built into these projects so we
29 can do more of them. I mean, we should be able to do both
30 of them for that cost if the attitude was going in with
31 how do we cut the costs out, where do we find people to
32 help for nothing, are there fishermen that will haul the
33 stuff over there on their boat for nothing just because
34 they want to find out what's going on there?

35
36 There's a lot of people that live there
37 that have seine boats, there's people in Cordova that
38 have seine boats, is there any -- have volunteers gone
39 out with the oil spill, or, I mean, or would people
40 actually say -- I mean, we built the hatcheries and
41 everyone volunteered to haul stuff over there, you know,
42 to start off with. Can we figure out how to work some of
43 that in some of these projects so we can do more of them?
44 I mean, can we request that the people who put these
45 projects on the table explore how to cut it down, you
46 know, at a lower cost by including the community and
47 other organizations like that on a volunteer basis? I
48 mean, just so we can do more of them. It just seems a
49 shame that we can only do, you know, we can only add one
50 project out of two and the cost is that high. So, like I

00331

1 said, I better shut up. And, that was not a criticism to
2 you, you know, it just blows me away. Fred?

3

4 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, in response to your
5 comments, I can appreciate that. What I would be a
6 little bit concerned, if this is a major subsistence area
7 for the village, I wouldn't ask others to open up trails
8 and so forth and made a recreation area out of it, you
9 know. Maybe the Village of Tatitlek might be approached,
10 the people there that utilize it, but once you open up
11 trails and so forth, the recreation people come in and
12 pretty soon the subsistence fishing is lost. So, I'd
13 just be a little bit careful about that. You know, the
14 hatchery efforts were a different situation where
15 everybody benefited.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So these are the two
18 that are in front of us, Doug?

19

20 MR. MCBRIDE: Correct and our
21 recommendation is to fund all of one and part of the
22 other.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, do we have
25 some of the other kind of projects, too?

26

27 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28 Again, for the record, I'm Polly Wheeler and I'm with
29 Fisheries Information Services, and our Office of
30 Subsistence Management. If you look at table four, which
31 is on page 233 in your Board book, it provides a review
32 of the TEK and harvest monitoring projects.

33

34 There's three projects on the table,
35 although the third one, the bottom one, project 03-045,
36 which is Cook Inlet C&T Subsistence Fisheries Assessment,
37 the project was actually implemented at the direction of
38 the Board. The first year was funded by the Board. The
39 second year of funding is coming out of FIS funding, so
40 it's not really up for discussion, per se, but we wanted
41 to put it on the chart there so that you saw that that
42 project was coming out of FIS funds, just for
43 clarification.

44

45 The first two projects, 03-010 and 03-
46 027, the 03-010 is the GIS atlas of C&T subsistence fish
47 harvest in the upper Copper, and the second one is
48 traditional knowledge of long term changes in salmon runs
49 in the Copper River. They were both good projects, they
50 both satisfied the criteria as Doug outlined earlier, but

00332

1 the TRC felt that with the second project the traditional
2 knowledge of long term changes, the PI on that project is
3 Bill Simeone, who I think spoke to you guys last spring,
4 and you know the kind of work that he's involved in and
5 he's extremely involved in the work to the point where he
6 doesn't have a lot of extra time. So, the recommendation
7 of the TRC was to maybe pull back on that project for now
8 because he's over, I won't say over-committed, but he's
9 definitely committed on the project, on existing
10 projects, so the TRC felt that while the project had some
11 merit, there was obligations on the part of the PI that
12 precluded him from doing that. So, the project that was
13 recommended for funding by the Technical Review Committee
14 is the GIS atlas of customary and traditional subsistence
15 fish harvest in the upper Copper.

16

17 That project builds on previous FIS
18 funded projects. One of them was the one that Bill spoke
19 to you about last spring about the 00-040 TEK of salmon
20 in the upper Copper. The other one is 01-110, which is
21 the TEK of non-salmon species. And there was another FIS
22 project that actually bought some GIS equipment for CRNA
23 and put it in place. So this project is building on
24 previous projects, both in terms of data collection, but
25 also in terms of equipment that is on the ground.

26

27 So the TRC recommended that project for
28 funding with a couple of modifications. One is that they
29 include a little bit of extra funding for consultation
30 with Subsistence Division because obviously the two
31 projects that this project is based on in terms of data
32 collection, are projects that were done by the
33 Subsistence Division, so they need to have close
34 consultation with the PI and that wasn't included as an
35 element. And, as you know, the Subsistence Division
36 doesn't have a lot of extra, they don't have a big slush
37 fund, so it was recommended that they be included for a
38 little bit of extra funding.

39

40 And the other modification is that they
41 work with the new social scientist position that Native
42 Village of Eyak recently got under the Partner's Program,
43 which, if you'll indulge me a little bit later on I can
44 just give you a quick update on that, but -- so those are
45 the two modifications that the TRC recommended on that
46 project. So, with the three projects on line, the one
47 recommended for funding is the 03-010 and as I said, the
48 03-045 project has already been, or is funded under FIS
49 funding, but it's not up for discussion.

50

00333

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, that basically, if I
2 understand right, that basically comes out of the funding
3 we would have had available for this year the, right?

4
5 MS. WHEELER: That's correct.

6
7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, thank you, Polly.
10 I guess the concern I have, traditionally, the 027
11 project I would imagine part of that would be
12 interviewing elders and data gathering from them, is that
13 correct?

14
15 MS. WHEELER: That's correct.

16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: And not to be morbid, but
18 I'd be concerned with postponing that given the age of
19 many of our elders in that part of the world, at least
20 from my limited experience. Is that not a concern,
21 or.....

22
23 MR. WHEELER: It's definitely a concern.
24 It's a concern statewide, really. But, looking at the
25 projects that are on line, I mean, these kinds of
26 projects take a lot of time, and with the project 00-040
27 they're not TKF salmon species, that is, that final
28 report is close to a year late just because, well it was
29 turned in close to a year late, just because the work
30 takes a lot of time to get up and running, and if you're
31 going to do a good job, which Dr. Simeone does, you need
32 to take a lot of time in working with all the different
33 partners on that.

34
35 Similarly, with 01-010 the non-salmon TEK
36 project, that's also behind. So we just felt that based
37 on the workload and based on the workload of the
38 partners, there's five Tribal partners involved in that
39 project, people have about as much on their plate as they
40 can deal with. So it's not, I mean, we definitely
41 recognize the reality of the fact that we're all getting
42 older. But the other reality is there's work that's
43 already been funded that needs to get completed before we
44 can move on to the next project. And the PI -- I
45 actually spoke to Bill on several occasions, and he's
46 fully cognoscente of the fact that he's got about as much
47 as he can possibly do, and then some.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.
50

00334

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, in line, at least I
2 know some of the Tribal entities I've talked to are going
3 through the process of interviewing people and
4 establishing data. Are we working with them in this, in
5 027, is there a possibility of, without gaining
6 additional help from some of the Tribal entities and data
7 gathering in concert with some of the things they have
8 ongoing? That was clear as mud, I'm sorry.

9

10 MS. WHEELER: Right. Thank you.

11

12 MR. CHURCHILL: I could tell, the deer in
13 the headlight look. I guess in tying, like in Northway
14 and Tetlin, there seems to be some ongoing projects of
15 interviewing elders and gathering data. And I'm
16 wondering if we had specific questions we had, and I
17 would imagine we do, if we could talk to them and say,
18 hey, this is the kind of data we're trying to gather, and
19 having them do that along with, either at low or no cost
20 and really not at any additional effort. Have we
21 explored that as an alternative to kind of address the
22 time sensitivity of this?

23

24 MS. WHEELER: Yeah, I mean there are
25 other projects, and on page 270 of your Board book all of
26 the projects that have been funded through FIS are
27 listed. And there's a number of TEK projects that are on
28 that chart. There's also clearly, like on the upper
29 Tanana there's also some other efforts that are ongoing
30 that are not necessarily funded through IFS, but are
31 funded by Fish and Wildlife Service Cost Challenge Grant,
32 that sort of thing. There's a lot of efforts.

33

34 I guess speaking from my prospective in
35 terms of building a social science program, is that it's
36 really important to collect this information, but it's
37 equally, if not more important, to make the information
38 accessible. And that's been, in my mind, the real
39 stopgap. I mean, that's been the real problem, is that
40 there's a lot of stuff out there that's collected, but in
41 terms of organization, making it available to managers,
42 pulling it together in a manner that's rather than taped
43 interviews, which the managers don't have the time to
44 listen to taped interviews or read the transcripts even,
45 we need to focus on pulling together existing, you know,
46 in addition to collecting it it's organizing it, making
47 it -- pulling out themes, making it useful, and so I
48 think there's efforts. I know the Alaska Native Language
49 Center has been working a lot in the upper Tanana area. I
50 mean there are pockets, there are efforts all over the

00335

1 place and Tribal entities are certainly working on that,
2 too. But in terms of funding through FIS we need -- we
3 have an obligation to make sure that the information that
4 is collected is also useful and used in management. So,
5 we certainly support all these efforts, but we also have
6 this other.

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, my concern was time
9 sensitivity and the idea that as we talked about earlier,
10 some of these folks can give us 100, 150, 200 year cycles
11 that we can look at that are real valuable in
12 understanding the resource. Thank you, very much.

13

14 MS. WHEELER: You're welcome.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Where do we go from
17 here?

18

19 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, that
20 concludes our presentation. You have the draft
21 recommendation in front of you, so our recommendation
22 would be for the Council to deliberate and provide us
23 your recommendation on our recommendation.

24

25 UNIDENTIFIED: How many of your children
26 want to work on this project?

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anyhow, we have before
29 us three projects that are recommended. We could make a
30 motion to put them on the table and recommend them,
31 unless you see something else that you think needs
32 recommended instead.

33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: So moved.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved that we
37 go along with the recommendations of the TRC. Do I hear
38 a second?

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS: Second.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
43 seconded. Any discussion, which already had.

44

45 MS. WELLS: Call the question.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question's been
48 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

49

50 IN UNISON: Aye.

00336

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
2 saying nay.

3

4 (No opposing votes).

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Now, the
7 next section.

8

9 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, we have a
10 very brief second presentation. It's more of this
11 lighter yellow handout, and again this is going to
12 address issues that are under tab F in the book starting
13 on page 239. And, Mr. Chairman, the point of this
14 presentation is to review and for the Council to go back
15 and look at your issues and information needs.

16

17 The reason why we need to do this right
18 now is that now what we are going to do is look ahead a
19 year in the year 2004 and the Council's issues and
20 information needs really are the starting point for us
21 and what we present to the potential investigators out
22 there and the requests for proposals in terms of the
23 subject matters that's important. So, this gets right in
24 on the very front end of trying to determine relatively
25 speaking what's important in this area to study.

26

27 If you go to the third page of that
28 handout or follow along on page 268 of the Council book
29 it's the same draft that we looked at before. It's the
30 finances of the Fishery Resource Monitoring Program, and
31 I won't go back through the whole spiel again, but what I
32 do want to focus on the far right hand side of that graph
33 is the bar for the year 2004, and at the top part of that
34 is a relatively large segment of that bar with a number
35 in it, 4 comma 883, that's \$4,883,000. That's how much
36 money we anticipate will be available in FY '04. And
37 clearly it's, you know, several fold more than what was
38 available this year and the whole reason that that money
39 amount has gone up is that because the total dollars of
40 the program have gone up, but because we have financially
41 cleared out prior obligations to the extent that we
42 could. And you remember back when I talked about the RFP
43 for '03, we only allowed one year for continuation
44 projects, that was all designed to maximize the amount of
45 money available in '04 so that each Council and the
46 public within those regions can then have as good a
47 discussion, if you will, of what's important to fund.
48 So, we're looking at a relatively large amount of money
49 available in '04. In fact this is the largest amount of
50 money that's been available since the '01 installment of

00337

1 the program.

2

3 If you turn the page in that handout
4 there's a page there titled Future Issues for the
5 Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, and what I'd like
6 to really briefly talk to you about, and we discussed
7 this at our last meeting in March for the first time,
8 what we're looking at is strategic planning, what's
9 important for this region, what's more important if they
10 posed other subjects. And the approach that we offered
11 in March and that we're offering again is we think the
12 best thing to do is to kind of frame the debate, if you
13 will, by asking a series of questions, and then providing
14 answers to those questions, and discussing the answers to
15 those questions. And what's on that page are the five
16 questions that we pose to try to frame in, if you will,
17 or put the sideboards on, what's more important than
18 other things. And I'll just briefly go through these
19 questions.

20

21 The first one, how well project
22 selections to date address the Council's issues and
23 information needs? What that's really all about is what
24 we would call gap analysis. We look at the issues and
25 information needs that you have come up with, we look at
26 the project selections that have been funded to date, and
27 ask questions, is there some issue and information need
28 that really has gone unfunded so far. So, that's what
29 that's all about.

30

31 The second question, which issues and
32 information needs likely require annual collection of a
33 long-term data set? This gets to the whole idea of
34 continuation projects, even though there's an issue and
35 information need that may have had several projects
36 funded in associate with it, the issue is current. It
37 goes on clearly longer than three or four years and it
38 needs to be looked at. So, that's what that question is
39 about.

40

41 The third one, are there funding
42 guidelines or alternative funds that should be considered
43 in recommendations for project selections. This gets at
44 the idea of cost share? And clearly we are pushing this
45 heavily to try to make the dollars in the Fisheries
46 Monitoring Program go as far as we can.

47

48 The fourth question is a new one that we
49 did not talk about in March. It is, are there additional
50 regulatory or management concerns that should be

00338

1 considered in recommendations for project selection?
2 This question really is the opportunity for the
3 management agencies, Fish and Wildlife Service, the
4 Forest Service, BLM, Park Service, to ask the question,
5 are the Council's issues and information needs for this
6 region complete? Is there something going on say through
7 the Federal Board process, is there something going on in
8 terms of management concern, is there something going on
9 that ought to be addressed that perhaps is not in the
10 issues and information needs. So, that's what that
11 question is about.

12

13 The fifth question, what are the results
14 of the projects to date? I mean, this is just about the
15 performance and results of projects to date. And what we
16 would like to do with this particular question is at the
17 March meeting is bring you a fairly complete performance
18 report, you know. Here's all the projects that have been
19 funded, they are either complete or ongoing, what's going
20 on, has the performance been satisfactory or not, what
21 are the results to date. So, that's what we'll be
22 talking about in March. So what I'd like to just real
23 briefly do in the next couple of minutes is talk about
24 these first four questions.

25

26 The first one, how well have project
27 selections to date addressed Council issues and
28 information needs? There is a fairly detailed summary of
29 this on pages 270 and 271 of the Council book, but the
30 short answer is, very well. And this isn't surprising.
31 I mean, we've aimed the project at the issues and
32 information needs with really the, I guess I would
33 portray it as a fairly minor exception, stock assessment
34 of burbot in the Copper River, we've never had a burbot
35 project. We've addressed the Council's issues and
36 information need. So, like I say, with the exception of
37 the Copper River burbot we don't see any glaring holes in
38 terms of what we've funded so far.

39

40 The last part of that I think bears
41 mentioning, where we say a few project address similar
42 issues in Prince William Sound and the Council should
43 explicitly address issues and information needs for
44 Prince William Sound. Again, I think that ought to be
45 something that you should discuss at the conclusion of
46 this presentation, is how does Prince William Sound
47 relate say to the Copper River in terms of relative
48 importance.

49

50 If you turn the page, the second

00339

1 question, which issues and information needs likely
2 require annual collection of long-term data sets? Again,
3 there's a more detailed discussion of this on pages 271
4 and 272 of the Council book, but our idea for how to
5 proceed through this is to kind of look at it in a step-
6 wise fashion. What we recommend is first of all we would
7 look at the area and say, look at the annual collection
8 and reporting of basic subsistence harvest assessments,
9 just the annual harvest assessments for subsistence, and
10 is there a glaring hole there that we need to plug with
11 this program? In this region, by and large, the answer
12 is the annual estimates of subsistence harvest are pretty
13 credible, certainly when you compare them to other areas
14 of the state. So, that's the first thing we would look
15 at but that's probably not a real big deal in this part
16 of the world.

17

18 The second one we would look at is
19 periodic collection and reporting baseline subsistence
20 harvest information including traditional ecological
21 knowledge or TEK. This is a big deal in this part of the
22 world. And what, you know, what we would recommend in
23 terms of long term data sets is to go in and periodically
24 collect the kind of information, Mr. Churchill, that you
25 were talking about with Polly earlier, but that kind of
26 work.

27

28 And then third, annual collection
29 reporting of Chinook stock assessment, particularly
30 estimates of river abundance, and we see that as long
31 term data need for the Copper River in particular.

32

33 And then fourth, annual collection
34 reporting sockeye stock assessment. Similar kind of
35 information. And again, that would certainly relate for
36 the Copper River and would to some extent would relate to
37 Prince William Sound, but that's something you need to
38 address in your discussions.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Doug?

41

42 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, sir.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now these aren't all on
45 Federal land, are they? These projects don't have to be
46 on Federal land?

47

48 MR. MCBRIDE: Well, actually, to be
49 funded out of this program they do.

50

00340

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

2

3 MR. MCBRIDE: They need to -- they may
4 not have to physically be on Federal land but they need
5 to -- there needs to be what we call a nexus.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They need to apply
8 to.....

9

10 MR. MCBRIDE: Exactly.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:Federal
13 subsistence?

14

15 MR. MCBRIDE: Yes, absolutely.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's why we have
18 so few of them for the Kenai. I mean basically we don't
19 have that much Federal waters and Federal subsistence
20 fisheries out there like we do in the Copper.

21

22 MR. MCBRIDE: The short answer is yes.
23 Although that whole subject matter is in the process of
24 being sorted out, if you will, from the regulatory side.

25

26
27 The third question, are there funding
28 guidelines or alternative funds that should be
29 considered? The short answer again is yes. There are a
30 couple of major funding sources in this part of the
31 world, you know, the whole GEM process through EVO's,
32 there may be some application where their interests
33 coincide with the interests of this program where we
34 could perhaps come up with some joint funded type
35 projects.

36

37 There's some other funding sources, the
38 Wildlife Fisheries Corporation, through the Forest
39 Service is one, other major agencies, those kind of
40 things. But again, as we look at projects on into the
41 future we're putting a very high premium on proposals
42 that come into the cost share for all the obvious reasons
43 that we discussed before.

44

45 And then the final question, are there
46 additional regulatory or management concerns that should
47 be considered? Really, the short answer to our knowledge
48 right now is no. There aren't any overriding management
49 concerns on the part of the agencies that would fall
50 outside of the issues and information needs that you've

00341

1 already identified. However, we do recommend that you
2 address the relative importance of Prince William Sound.

3

4

5 Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
6 presentation on that and I would be glad to answer
7 questions.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Doug.

10

11 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, first of all, just
12 one comment on 273, 241. If you look at the cost
13 estimate for a project that per diem is only \$19, maybe
14 that will help you a little bit in your cost thinking.
15 But, you know, the Cook Inlet Project, what is the hang-
16 up on the Kenai River? It seems to be something there
17 that's not jelling. I know the rural-urban fight and so
18 forth in the past, but still, the Kenai River is
19 basically Federal lands and the lake systems of Skilak
20 and Kenai Lake, why don't we have a project on there?

21

22 MR. MCBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elvsaas,
23 we do have a project. It's that Cook Inlet Subsistence
24 Harvest Use project. And, like I said, that project was
25 committed to for '03 prior to this. We included it in
26 the table for informational purposes. The point of that
27 project is to look at subsistence needs and harvest
28 patterns of Federally qualified rural residents in Cook
29 Inlet, on the Kenai Peninsula in particular, and use that
30 information then to look through the Federal Board
31 process whether or how the Federal subsistence fisheries
32 should involve, the regulations for those fisheries
33 should evolve beyond what they currently are. And what
34 they currently are right now is that they simply mirror
35 sport fishing regulations from the State. So, that was
36 done as an interim measure pending gathering of
37 additional information and that project is the gathering
38 of additional information.

39

40 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, it's ironic the
41 State requires to do subsistence and in personal use
42 fisheries you have to have a sport license. So, these
43 people like myself were listed as sport fishermen in all
44 the data, when in fact we're not. You know, what we need
45 is something the uses. And there are areas in Cook
46 Inlet, like Ralph was talking about, like the Crescent
47 River. Crescent Lake is in the Lake Clark National Park.
48 The river comes out to State lands into Cook Inlet. And
49 there is a weir on Crescent River collecting data on the
50 fish, but these are areas that could be supportive to the

00342

1 subsistence needs in the Cook Inlet area. But, you know,
2 I'd like to see more effort, especially on the Kenai and
3 Kasilof systems as to what can be done to satisfy the
4 subsistence needs of the people within the Peninsula
5 besides the so called designated urban areas. There's a
6 lot of people that would benefit from that but maybe
7 that's something we should look at further down the road.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Polly.

10

11 MS. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. That
12 project that is on your list is currently in its first
13 year and they're actually having scoping meetings, the
14 first one of which I believe is being held in Cooper
15 Landing on next Tuesday night. And they are going to be
16 having a series of scoping meetings talking to people in
17 that area and based on that information that they gather
18 in that first year they are going to then be doing
19 household surveys and talking to people. So, I think
20 you'll find that the project is just sort of gearing up
21 right now and there will be considerable work done in
22 this arena in the next year and a half. So, I think
23 you'll find some of your concerns are addressed through
24 that project.

25

26 MR. ELVSAAS: Great, great. I think
27 basically those people in the area, the response will be,
28 hey, it's about time. Thank you.

29

30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, at this point, what
31 you are looking for from us is if we have any needs that
32 we feel haven't been met, any issues like what Fred
33 brought up that we see in the future as needs for the
34 Council, any comments on the work that's already been
35 done, that kind of thing, right?

36

37 MR. MCBRIDE: Absolutely, Mr. Chair.

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. As a Council, do
40 we see anything, any shortfalls in areas or any specific
41 needs that need to be addressed within the limitations of
42 the program, or, but especially needs that could be
43 possibly started to be addressed next year when the
44 funding will be larger? Mr. Churchill.

45

46 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, and this may be
47 something that can be done along with existing projects,
48 like, you know, Polly mentioned. One of the concerns
49 we've talked about is the amount of fish take with out of
50 state anglers using sport gear, large amounts of fish

00343

1 being taken, and if there would be an opportunity to
2 gather either anecdotal or other information about that
3 in connection with the ongoing projects, I think that
4 could be valuable to us. Sue talked about doing a
5 project with the Advisory Committees in concert with the
6 RAC's to maybe try to identify if a problem exists and
7 the scope of the problem.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

10

11 MS. WELLS: I don't know if this is the
12 right forum or the right people to talk to, but somebody
13 out there is. I would really like to see on the sport
14 fishing license that I have to buy to go down to gather
15 my clams or fish, other than my Tribal net, a place on
16 that license to distinguish between a personal use fisher
17 or a sport fisher. And, then also, some kind of, through
18 that process those of us that purchase those license or
19 those that come into our state from other places that
20 purchase that license, gathering data of where you fished
21 and maybe the types of gear used, so that we have that
22 information. Like Fred, and I've talked with Fred about
23 this quite often, many of the regulations that are
24 imposed are using me as a sport user, and I've never been
25 a sport user, but I have to buy a sport license. And I'm
26 not trying to be a bad sport, but I do want to be counted
27 in the right numbers. And, so I think just by having a
28 place where I can designate who I am as a user of the
29 resource that would give us more accurate data in
30 allocations and even trying to find out the information
31 and allocate monies for different types of projects and
32 research, tailor making it more to the people of our
33 State.

34

35 MR. ELVSAAS: I was just reminded that
36 Cook Inlet is coming up on the agenda, an update, so
37 maybe that'll get something there.

38

39 MS. WELLS: I think this would be good
40 information for not just Cook Inlet, but Prince William
41 Sound, Copper River, any of our areas that are being
42 advertised across the world for recreational fishing. I
43 have no problem with people coming up and enjoying our
44 state, it's the, maybe the damage that they leave because
45 they don't appreciate our state as much as we do. I
46 mean, that maybe sounds a little nasty sitting here with
47 this guy here, but I think that the residents of this
48 state really love our resources and are mindful of our
49 take and how we take them, and how we use what we take,
50 and some of our visitors aren't here long enough for us

00344

1 to teach them that.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In that line, Doug, from
4 what's been brought up I know that that's an issue that
5 we've talked about from everything from the quantity, to
6 the quality, to the impact on the environment. And that
7 possibly would be something in the future if that would
8 be a project that I've heard other Councils talk about
9 the same problem in their area, and I know it's a problem
10 in our areas, is the impact of the grow- -- just like
11 what happened on the Kenai this spring with the Board of
12 Fish, the growing impact and power of the, I'll use the
13 word tourist sport fishery, on the subsistence and
14 personal use fisheries of the state. We saw what
15 happened on the Kenai where basically the run was held
16 for them because of the outcry that came from, I'll say
17 Alaskans, and I won't qualify them as either personal use
18 sport fishermen or subsistence use fisherman, that wait a
19 second, these fish have more value as our food than they
20 do to support an industry that is just coming in there to
21 play with the fish and leave. And that impact has been
22 talked about all over the state, and it has an impact on
23 subsistence fishermen, it has an impact on commercial
24 fishermen who live in the state, it has an impact on
25 sport fishermen in the state who want to take fish for
26 food for personal use fisherman. And so somewhere along
27 the line we need some research as to what, how, it's like
28 what R.J. was talking about, what is the impact of a
29 growing industry like that on all of the industries that,
30 or all of the people that were here before? And, if
31 something could be done in that order I think it would
32 have real value.

33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: So, in addition to
35 tourist season are we talking about a bag limit? No, I'm
36 just teasing.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any how, that's the
39 only, that's, you know, some of the issues that we've
40 talked about are some of the issues that I know have been
41 brought up in our Council. I feel that, you know, as
42 Southcentral has road access we have such complex issues
43 of user groups on all of our systems that the more stock
44 assessment data that we can collect on whether our
45 systems are holding their own or going uphill or going
46 downhill is of the biggest importance. I mean, you can't
47 manage fish if you don't know what's there or what should
48 be there.

49

50 And, I really, you know, to me, Tanada

00345

1 Creek on the upper Copper shows what gets through to the
2 upper Copper and the upper Copper systems. I'm glad to
3 see Fish and Game putting something in on the Gulkana for
4 the people that are involved in that project, because
5 that's a major contributory of, we've got a small
6 assessment going on in the Chitina Valley, we've got some
7 assessment going on in the lower Copper. We're going to
8 need the same kind of things in the Prince William Sound,
9 we're going to need the same kind of things any place
10 where there's multiple user groups accessing the fish.
11 And that goes for the Kenai and that goes for all the
12 other systems in our area.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I guess just as a
15 point of information, I know ISER put out a fairly
16 comprehensive report on the use of sport fisheries. That
17 data is somewhat dated but it was a fairly massive effort
18 that speaks to resident, nonresident take, where they go,
19 species of fish harvested. I don't think it's terribly
20 expense, I think I paid 25 bucks for it, but it's a great
21 deal of data and I think ISER put a lot of effort into it
22 in cooperation with ADF&G. It may be a good source
23 document for our Advisory Council, and real reasonable as
24 far as costs rather than collecting that data ourselves.
25 I think it was '93 or '94, I could be wrong, but good
26 information and speaks a lot to the Kenai.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Do we have
29 any more questions or anymore things that we need to
30 address to Doug and Polly?

31

32 MS. WHEELER: Mr. Chair, if I could, real
33 briefly, item 14.2.C on our agenda is an update on the
34 Partners Program, and if I could take just a couple
35 minutes and give you an update now would that be alright?

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

38

39 MS. WHEELER: Okay. On page 281 of your
40 Board book you have an overview of the Partners for
41 Fisheries Monitoring Program, and I just wanted to give
42 you an update on where we stand with that. We've, as of
43 early September, we've, all of the cooperative agreements
44 are in place, they've been signed by all involved
45 parties, and of the seven positions, as is outlined on
46 page 281, we've got six biologist positions, 1.3, I'm
47 always embarrassed to say that, the 1.3 social scientists
48 positions, and then there is also seven internship
49 positions that is part of this program as well.

50

00346

1 Currently, we've actually, four positions
2 are filled. I'm happy to say the Native Village of Eyak
3 has recently hired Erica McCall, who I believe is here,
4 right back there, and she'll be serving all of
5 Southcentral Region and we'll be working with her to
6 figure out some projects that she can work on and
7 certainly keeping in mind your point earlier about the
8 need to talk to people and document existing information.
9 So, that will be certainly one of Erica's, I'm sure,
10 something she'll be working on. In addition to Erica's
11 hire, Kuskokwim Native Association has hired their
12 biologist, Dave Cannon is his name, he used to work for
13 the Federal, he's got 23 years I guess of Federal
14 service.

15
16 Tanana Chiefs has just recently hired
17 their biologist, Kim Malcolm is her name and she just
18 started a week ago. And Bristol Bay hired their
19 biologist. I guess the original hire was terminated but
20 they've got actually a local person that's acting in that
21 position. And then the Council of Athabascan Tribal
22 Governments is currently recruiting as is the Association
23 of Village Council Presidents. They are recruiting for
24 both biologists position and the .3 social scientists
25 position.

26
27 So, the program is up and running. We
28 really look forward to having the new hirees be working
29 on projects, be working with local folks, talking about
30 the program. Part of their job is community outreach,
31 training, identification of subsistence issues, working
32 on existing projects, getting some other projects
33 developed and up and running. So, they are a resource
34 both for you and for this program and we're real happy to
35 have them on board. So, hopefully the other hires can be
36 made and get these guys to hit the ground running. So,
37 just wanted to give you an update on that, Mr. Chair.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
40 questions?

41
42 (No audible response)

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. I think
45 we're going to go on to 14 because I know that Peggy has
46 to leave. Is Peggy still here? Oh, she left. She's
47 here, I see her, and she is going to be standing in for
48 Tim Jennings. So, we're going to go, we're going to skip
49 13 at this point in time, we're going to go on to 14.
50 And I will -- the Forest Service, is it important that

00347

1 you -- you don't have to leave, do you?

2

3 (No audible response)

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So, I think I'm
6 going to skip one and go to two. And we'll come back to
7 one. And that way we can start with Peggy. Office of
8 Subsistence Management, under 14.

9

10 MS. FOX: Good afternoon Mr. Chair and
11 Council Members. I am Peggy Fox, the Deputy Assistant
12 Regional Director for Subsistence with the Office of
13 Subsistence Management. And at this time I'd like to
14 refer you to a briefing paper under tab H entitled
15 Regional Advisory Councils. That touches on the topic of
16 review of Regional Council composition for compliance
17 with FACA.

18

19 This is one of our so called facts sheets
20 that we develop for wide distribution on a topic that is
21 of current interest to people. However, my talking
22 points are going to provide you with an overview of where
23 we're at with that process and then I'd be glad to take
24 questions.

25

26 So, earlier this year you received a copy
27 of a letter from the Department of the Interior that is
28 now referred to as the Griles' letter. It spoke to the
29 departmental concerns about the membership balance of
30 Regional Advisory Councils. And I would like to note
31 that this was part of a nationwide review of Federal
32 Advisory Committees and that in concert with the active
33 litigation that we're experiencing right now from the
34 Safari Club have resulted in a little bit more focused
35 review on our program.

36

37 As you know, the Councils are subject to
38 the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act,
39 I'll refer to as FACA, and FACA requires the Membership
40 Advisory Committee to be fairly balanced in terms of the
41 points of view represented and the functions to be
42 performed by an Advisory Committee. In other words, what
43 the Griles' letter has indicated is that we need to be
44 looking at a composition of all directly affected
45 interests as we move, as we operate as a Council.

46

47 The Department has asked the Board then,
48 asked the Board at that time then to review its
49 procedures used to select members for Councils. Recently
50 the Chair of the Board, Mitch Demientieff, was

00348

1 interviewed by the Alaska Public Radio Network and he
2 stated that the Regional Councils have been very
3 successful and well accepted throughout the state.
4 However, as with any program there is always room for
5 improvement. The Board then recently completed its
6 proposed changes to Council composition in a meeting in
7 August and you received a copy of the letter that the
8 Board submitted dated August 26, it was quite a thick
9 document, like this. That was the Board's submittal to
10 the Department in response to the Griles' letter.

11

12 On September 17, very recently, we
13 received a response from Deputy Secretary Griles, which
14 stated that the Board's recommendations are to be
15 implemented without delay. He said that the Board
16 recommendations will strengthen the program to the
17 benefit of all residents of Alaska. The changes approved
18 by the Office of the Secretary include; increased
19 membership on most Councils, the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta
20 and this Council, the Southcentral Council, will increase
21 their memberships from 11 and 7 respectively to 13 in
22 each Council. The Southeast Council will remain at 13
23 members. The remaining Council's will all increase their
24 membership to 10. Larger Councils will allow additional
25 opportunities for representation of other directly
26 affected interests, recreational, sport, and commercial
27 uses specifically, that have a direct and legitimate
28 interest in subsistence allocations.

29

30 Another change approved by the Secretary
31 was a change in Council composition whereby Council's
32 will have designated seats. Seventy percent for
33 representatives of subsistence interests and thirty
34 percent for representatives of recreational sport and
35 commercial interests. For the seven Councils with ten
36 members, three seats will be designated to recreation
37 sport and commercial interests. Of the three Councils
38 with 13 members, four seats will be designated
39 recreational sport and commercial interest. For example,
40 your current Council currently has seven members. With
41 the changes that have been adopted the membership will
42 increase to 13. Of these, nine seats will represent
43 subsistence interests and four seats will represent
44 recreational sports and commercial interests, most likely
45 divided in half, two for each type of interest area.

46

47 All Council members will continue to be
48 residents of their Council region as required by Title
49 VIII. All members must be knowledgeable of subsistence
50 uses of fish and wildlife within the region. Council

00349

1 members may be either rural or non-rural as in the past,
2 but still must reside within their respective regions.

3

4 With regard to alternates, some Council's
5 have alternates on their Council's as a way to assure
6 obtaining a quorum. Alternates, however, will be allowed
7 to complete their terms, however, they will be
8 discontinued in future years.

9

10 The nomination application process that was
11 described in the August 26 letter has a number of changes
12 in it that, I won't go into detail here but I will
13 entertain questions on when I conclude, if you'd like.
14 These changes will be phased in over three years
15 beginning with the application and nomination process in
16 2003. Full implementation of the changes in the
17 composition must be complete by 2006.

18

19 One more item, before we open this up for
20 questions I wanted to refer you to a September 26 letter
21 which you should have received. It was mailed to
22 everyone and I see there are copies here for your, I
23 guess I don't have a copy right here, but I know they're
24 on the table. They're from Mitch as the Chair of the
25 Board with regard to the decision that was made by the
26 Office of the Secretary and it was addressed to each and
27 every one of the Council members. In the letter he
28 stated that while the Council served to ensure that the
29 subsistence priority in ANILCA is preserved, the Board
30 also wants to ensure that the question of membership
31 balance is in compliance with the Federal Advisory
32 Committee Act. He stated that the Board does not believe
33 that these two laws are conflict, but in fact will help
34 the Board make well informed decisions. He stated, and I
35 quote, compliance with ANILCA protects the subsistence
36 priority and compliance with FACA ensures that all
37 interests directly affected by the Board's regulatory
38 decisions are involved in the process. He encouraged
39 Council members to work with the Board as these changes
40 take place.

41

42 And that concludes my comments, and I'd
43 be glad to take any questions or any comments from you at
44 this time.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Fred.

47

48 MR. ELVSAAS: The only concern I have is
49 did they get the funding to add more members? We're
50 almost double when we're full size now and it's going to

00350

1 take more funding for the program.

2

3 MS. FOX: That's correct, it is going to
4 take more funding, that we're going to have to find
5 within existing funds. There will be no additional
6 funding coming to support this. So, that is requiring
7 that we take a closer look at our budget, how we're
8 spending the money, and try to find those funds. But, we
9 will, we will be able to do that. That's not a barrier.

10

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Peggy, I have one
13 question, and it's a question that since I've seen this
14 has been bothering me. In the past we've tried to pick
15 people who have as broad a knowledge of cross knowledge
16 as we can get. Now we're talking about having people
17 representing specific points of view. Who says whether a
18 person is a sport fisherman, a commercial fisherman, or a
19 subsistence user? I'll just use myself for an example.
20 I hold a commercial license, I'm a charter operator, I
21 live a subsistence lifestyle. Who do I represent? In
22 the past that's the kind of the people we looked for, we
23 didn't say -- it's like what she was talking about on our
24 licenses. Do we have a place on our license that we
25 check that says, you know, I'm a subsistence, I mean on
26 our tag here, it says I'm a subsistence or I'm a
27 commercial?

28

29 Now, as a commercial do I have to
30 represent the commercial view, or should I take my
31 knowledge of subsistence and say this is ANILCA, this is
32 a subsistence thing? How do I, even as a commercial
33 fisherman represent what ANILCA stands for? And that's
34 the question that I come up with, is I don't see how. Do
35 we become advocates for a certain point of view or do we
36 actually look and see what ANILCA says and do we say
37 we're here to -- I mean that's what this Advisory Council
38 is for, we wear different hats in the life that we live
39 but this is, you know, what we're here for is to see that
40 this works in a way that does the least damage to
41 everybody, because that's what it says. You know, we're
42 supposed to make these subsistence decisions with the
43 least possible damage to other interest groups, but at
44 the same time maintain a subsistence priority. And how,
45 under this kind of, you know -- who is going to decide?

46

47 Let's say I say I'm a commercial
48 fisherman, then which interest group can say, wait a
49 second, he represents a subsistence view too strongly, we
50 don't want him on the table as a commercial fisherman.

00351

1 Or, what would happen if I say I'm a sports man, I run a
2 charter operation, and does the Outdoor Council say, wait
3 a second, we looked at his record in the past and he's
4 voted for commercial fishing in the past, he definitely
5 doesn't represent us as sport fishermen? You know? And
6 what do we do about things like that?

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: You know, having some
9 background in the Fish and Game Advisory Committee
10 System, we struggled with that, too. Our membership, the
11 one that I was on was 15 regular members, two alternates,
12 and we represented, I think, I know when I was Chair, 12
13 or 13 different groups ranging from processors to
14 trappers. And the kind of people that we were lucky
15 enough to have on there, my viewpoint was we got people
16 from different backgrounds because of what they could
17 bring to the table, but I think your point is an
18 excellent one. We tried to stay completely away from
19 advocacy of that position. We picked those people
20 because they could contribute their knowledge. We were
21 advocates for the resource first, as you pointed out.
22 And that knowledge was brought to the table so that we
23 could do a really good job of doing that, rather than
24 becoming just, you know, let's take a vote, we've got
25 four commercial fisherman, two sports fishermen.
26 Clearly, the vote's going to go that way. And frankly, I
27 didn't see that happen. I saw people being strong
28 advocates for the resource first and from what I've seen
29 from this RAC, I think if we choose wisely and are lucky
30 enough to get the candidates that's exactly what we will
31 see out of this. But I agree with it. It's absolutely
32 critical, once you become advocates it just destroys the
33 value of this system completely in my mind.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I definitely agree with
36 you on that, Bob, but what I see is like what we're
37 dealing right now, is the outside lawsuit. Do we now
38 have to satisfy outside interest groups that we are who
39 we say we are? I mean, do I have to decide who I am and
40 then do I have to satisfy the outside interest group that
41 I say I represent that I truly am one of them? Or do I
42 just decide who I am and nobody else can say, no, he's
43 not a commercial fisherman, he doesn't represent us, or
44 no, he's not a sport fisherman, he doesn't represent us,
45 or no, he's not a subsistence user, he doesn't represent
46 us? And that's the part that I'm asking. And maybe I'm
47 seeing more problems than there are. Peggy.

48

49 MS. FOX: Thank you, I'd like to respond.
50 When you started with your question you raised a concern

00352

1 about a broad knowledge, you know, of the resource and of
2 the activities in the region that that's what we wanted,
3 people who have lots of experience. And that has not
4 changed. We're still seeking candidates who have a broad
5 background. So that the criteria are knowledge of fish
6 and wildlife resources. That every, these are the same
7 criteria everyone has to meet when they apply. Knowledge
8 of subsistence uses, customs, and traditions in the
9 region, knowledge of recreational, commercial and other
10 uses in the region, leadership and experience with local
11 regional organizations, and the ability to communicate
12 effectively. Beyond the other two that you are willing
13 and able to travel and attend meetings. But those
14 criteria have not changed over the years and years and
15 they will not change.

16

17 So, first and foremost, we're looking for
18 highly qualified candidates regardless of what expertise
19 they may offer at the Council. And, highly qualified
20 candidates then obviously have to meet all these
21 criteria.

22

23 And when we start looking at what they
24 represent, the application form now will ask each
25 individual who applies to self-declare. Who do you
26 represent? And you can only choose one. You either
27 choose subsistence, let's see if I can pull it up here,
28 you choose, the choices that we have right now on the
29 application, which is still going under review, it's not
30 final, but subsistence, recreational sports, commercial
31 fishing, guides, transporters, or there is a place for
32 other. But, we're asking you as an applicant to check
33 one. Okay, that's the application process.

34

35 Then, in our normal process of reviewing
36 applications we interview the candidate, we interview the
37 references, but we also have a list of key contacts in
38 the region. So, for example, our key contact list will
39 have to be expanded to include other groups, other sport
40 groups, commercial groups, whatever, that might represent
41 recreational sport and commercial interests in that
42 region. And what we do is we tell them these are the
43 people that have applied, this is what we normally do,
44 you know, what are your, how do you think that they will
45 serve as a Council member representing your region?

46

47 And we will be, you know, asking in
48 addition now more specifically in representing your
49 interest area. For example, if they checked off
50 subsistence we'd be talking to Native corporations in the

00353

1 region, whatever, you know, how do you think they would
2 do representing subsistence as a Council Members? If it
3 was sports we'd ask a regional organization of sports,
4 Kenai Fly Fishers, whatever they're called, you know, how
5 do you think they'd do representing the sports interests
6 in the region. So, it doesn't rest on any one person's
7 opinion, but we ask a number of different organizations
8 as a cross-section in the region. And then, again, it's
9 like what sifts to the top as the most highly qualified
10 candidate. And that means that they also have to be,
11 we're also asking them about their leadership ability,
12 their participation in organizations, their
13 communications.

14 So, you know, we're looking for people who are
15 not singularly motivated in any interest, subsistence or
16 sports or otherwise. We're looking for people who will
17 contribute to a problem solving and decision making
18 process.

19
20 Okay. How that will operate then on the
21 Council when they get here. You know, you'll have seven
22 people representing subsistence and you'll have -- no,
23 you'll have nine on your Council, four people
24 representing other interests. They need to adequately
25 represent that interest. They don't have to vote in any
26 particular way. That does not require them to vote only
27 for things that are a benefit to sports or to vote in a
28 minority if it doesn't benefit sports. They are expected
29 to come to the table and put on the table the concern, if
30 there are some, or the issues relative to that interest.
31 But then the dialogue, you know, will occur, the
32 interaction will occur, and the problem solving, we hope,
33 will occur. So, you'll come to some common resolution.
34

35 That's what we're hoping for. That's the
36 vision. And, in fact, that has worked in many cases in a
37 lot of working groups that we have authorized to work on
38 moose management or on a number of issues, muskox, over
39 the years that we've been doing this program we tell, we
40 provide funds for them to meet, a couple of Council
41 representatives, some sports hunters if it's moose for
42 example, some community representatives, and they meet
43 and within a matter of a few meetings, which could be a
44 year or two, they come to some consensus on how to
45 resolve an issue. That's the model that we see is
46 possible now at the Council level.

47
48 So, I think I, okay, are we, do we have
49 to satisfy outside interest groups was the other comment
50 that you made. I don't think that that's our goal at all.

00354

1 It's not our goal to satisfy any particular group. It's
2 our goal to adhere to ANILCA and to FACA, and we will
3 definitely be working toward that goal as consistently as
4 we have in the past. The Safari Club lawsuit has made
5 some points that has required us to take a look at. I
6 mean when you're in litigation you're trying to solve the
7 problem before it gets before the court. And we have to
8 show that we've made every effort to try to do that if we
9 see some kind of vulnerability. And so, that's how this
10 review effected us, in particular in this program. And
11 there was some room for improvement as Mitch indicated.
12 So, I don't think we're trying to satisfy anybody, but we
13 are trying to adhere to the laws.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

16

17 MS. WELLS: You said that any applicant
18 would need to choose one of those points where that they
19 feel they represent the most. I'd be concerned about
20 that being fairly limiting if, and I look at this list
21 and being a subsistence user, commercial fisherman, you
22 know, I can check off more than one. You're more likely
23 to have a well rounded person that way, and maybe to have
24 them prioritize, but just to check off one I think would
25 give you a pretty limited scope of that person's ability
26 and contribution to the panel.

27

28 MS. FOX: I think the whole idea behind
29 checking off one is to demonstrate that we have a person
30 representing that interest who is sitting in that seat,
31 okay. It is not for the purposes, like I say, of trying
32 to limit what you say or what other interests you
33 represent or what other information you bring to the
34 table. But you do, if you identify subsistence, then,
35 you know, in the public setting here people are going to
36 be expecting you to make sure that the subsistence issues
37 get on the table and the subsistence viewpoints. But, we
38 will be looking for broader based people than somebody
39 who is just an expert in one area, you know. So, there's
40 different things going on here.

41

42 We have to, the designated seats
43 demonstrate without question that we have sought out
44 highly qualified candidates to represent those interests,
45 and that the directly affected people are sitting at the
46 table. That's it. From there on the dialogue goes on
47 and you all come to some common understanding of the
48 issues and the concerns, and you work through the
49 problems, hopefully, to consensus. That won't always be
50 the case and it isn't always the case on any Council as

00355

1 they exist right now, or on the Board, you know. We
2 often have majority votes and minority reports. So, that
3 will continue.

4

5 MS. WELLS: My concern, I attended some
6 meetings in Kenai for the Fish and Game Advisory and you
7 have people that are interested in serving on the
8 committees or the boards, but they don't represent the
9 right niche, so they can't run, or they may be, because I
10 have a commercial license I can't fill a seat that is
11 possibly sport, even if I was sport user. And so you're
12 really limiting the number of interested people. You
13 know, that's, we're finding here where we're a committee
14 of seven and we've got three here. I would be concerned
15 about interested people who really want to serve not
16 being able to because they've checked the wrong box.

17

18 MS. FOX: Well I think, especially in the
19 case of this Council, you have, you are going to add more
20 seats than any other Council. You know, you've been
21 limited, if you will, to seven seats for all the people
22 that might be interested in serving on this Council. Now
23 you're going to have 13. I think we've actually expanded
24 opportunity for your region. And that was also the
25 intent for expanding the size of the Councils elsewhere.
26 You know, we recognize we have some excellent people
27 serving on the Councils. We don't want them to go away,
28 we want them to stay, but we have to also provide seats
29 for other interests. So, to a varying degree, you know,
30 sometimes we're only adding one member, in this case
31 we're adding six. But we're trying to do the best we can
32 at some kind of compromise on that.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

35

36 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, in this process I
37 would hope that, you know, we'd make sure we kept the
38 interview process that's currently a process of it, or
39 part of that process. I know I felt mine was extensive
40 without being exhaustive, that it was good. I thought
41 the interviewer had a lot of personal knowledge and I
42 guess looking back it went a number of hours, and I think
43 that's a real important piece because we covered a lot of
44 specific information and it was drawn out. To loose that
45 I would hope in a sense of economy no one tries to
46 discard that. I think that's huge and real valuable.

47

48 And the other thing is as Susan was
49 talking about with these predesignated seats, I've worked
50 a fair amount of that with the Advisory Committed system

00356

1 and sat on some statewide lookouts and those, and I know
2 that's not what's being proposed with the RAC's in terms
3 of, but I'll tell you, with the AC's I think it's done
4 more harm than good in terms of getting good people on
5 the Advisory Committees. And if it ever heads that way
6 I'd be really concerned with narrowing that definition,
7 because it's, well, I mean, it's -- there are a number of
8 Advisory Committees around the state that can't, without
9 designated seats can't ever fill out their compliment,
10 so, that would be a real caution, too. I agree with
11 Susan on that. Thank you.

12

13 MS. FOX: I would just like to reassure
14 you that the panel process will not diminish and, if
15 anything will strengthen, because we have, we're going to
16 need to bring everybody together who serve on the panels
17 and go through all this again and look for, you know, all
18 the questions that need to be asked, because there's new
19 procedures and so on. But, like I indicated, the key
20 contact lists are going to lengthen, you know, and I
21 think the interview questions are going to expand. And
22 we do feel it is a very strong process.

23

24 So, in the end, when a Council member is
25 selected by the Secretary's Offices, it's actually gone
26 through three layers of review. One at the panel, the
27 local people, and from the agencies in the area doing all
28 of the extensive work in interviewing and contacting
29 people and organizations in the region to check
30 references, and so on, to this Staff Committee, and then
31 to the Board. And then the Board forwards their
32 recommendation to the Secretary. So, there is extensive
33 review looking for the best candidates.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any more
36 questions for Peggy? Do you have more for us then, or is
37 that it?

38

39 MS. FOX: Not on this subject.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, on another
42 subject?

43

44 MS. FOX: I could move on and talk to you
45 about statewide rural determinations. It's very brief.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Would you, please.

48

49 MS. FOX: Be glad to do that. Again, I
50 refer you to tab H, and I think perhaps this Council is

00357

1 more familiar with the rural determinations process than
2 probably any other Council in the state. So, as you
3 know, the Board is required by regulation to review rural
4 determinations upon receipt of the U.S. census data every
5 ten years. Recent requests to explore rural
6 determinations on the Kenai Peninsula revealed the need
7 to review the methods used to determine what is rural and
8 what is non-rural. So, the Board, through a competitive
9 process, hired the University of Alaska Institute of
10 Social and Economic Research in collaboration with Dr.
11 Robert Wolf and Associates to develop scientific methods
12 in order to make sound decisions on rural determinations.
13 So, ISER's report is now scheduled to be completed in
14 November, next month actually.

15
16 And, I wanted to -- the process we're
17 following includes two phases. The first phase is to
18 develop a methodology. You know, review what we've done,
19 see if it needs room for -- see if it need improvement.
20 And actually the contract indicated that they should look
21 at developing two methodologies in order to test one
22 against the other to try to find something that is as
23 thoroughly analyzed as possible that we feel we could
24 rest with for the next round of determinations. So,
25 their report is also actually being reviewed by what we
26 call peers in the field, other social scientists are
27 reviewing their work. So, we're trying to get as many
28 checks and balances built into the review of this
29 methodology as possible.

30 Sometime in November or December the ISER group
31 will present to the Board their proposed methodology and
32 then we will take that before the public January 15,
33 still as ISER's proposal to the Board. The intent of the
34 January 15th meeting then is for the Board to make a
35 final decision on a proposed methodology that will go out
36 for public comment and Council review. We want to have a
37 very open process and allow for plenty of opportunity for
38 people to have input on the methodology and understand
39 how it works and how it would be applied before the Board
40 makes a final decision in May.

41
42 Then, during the next year from
43 approximately June to next May we will be asking either a
44 new contractor or we will supplement the existing
45 contract and have ISER with Dr. Wolf apply the new
46 methodology and come up with a list of proposed
47 determinations for rural and non-rural. And also then,
48 at that time the public and the Councils will be asked to
49 review and comment on those findings shooting towards May
50 of 2004 for final determinations.

00358

1 Overall, I'd say we don't expect a lot of
2 change, but I think that we can all list the number of
3 communities that are on the boarder of the existing lines
4 that have been drawn in regulations where above 7,000 in
5 population is presumed non-rural unless there are, so to
6 speak, mitigating circumstances or unusual
7 characteristics. And, so, we can guess which communities
8 will probably be, you know, reviewed very, very closely
9 and some may be proposed for change. But, the bulk,
10 obviously, the bulk of the communities in Alaska are not
11 going to see any change.

12
13 So, that's simply an overview. If you
14 have questions I'd be glad to take them.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions for Peggy
17 on the timeline on this? Thank you.

18
19 MS. FOX: Thank you.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You'll make your plane?

22
23 MS. FOX: I certainly will. Thank you
24 very much.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, was there
27 anybody else that had a plane they had to make at 11?

28
29 (No audible response)

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you got anything
32 more on the table for us, Polly, other than the stuff
33 right here?

34
35 MS. WRIGHT: This is Sherry Wright,
36 department to Fish and Game.

37
38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sherry, I mean.

39
40 MS. WRIGHT: The only other thing that I
41 wanted to bring out was the meeting here, when you go to
42 do your meeting schedule for your next meeting, there is
43 a Board of Game meeting in Anchorage and it's on the
44 Southcentral and Southwestern Regions from, it starts
45 March 7 and goes through March 17. So, when you do your
46 next meeting if you would not do it during that time, if
47 that works. That's it. Thanks.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Okay. Well,
50 we're in 14. We've already had Partners for Fisheries

00359

1 Monitoring, we might as well take a break for five
2 minutes.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We're back on 14.

9

10 UNIDENTIFIED: And we're working in the
11 dark.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And we're working in the
14 dark, and the Forest Service has assured me that this is
15 a short presentation.

16

17 We're going to take up customary trade
18 after lunch because we recognize the fact that it may
19 take a longer time than anything else. And so we're
20 going to try to attempt to get as many little things done
21 here as we can prior to lunch time, so.

22

23 MR. JOYCE: Mr. Chairman and the rest of
24 the Council, my name is Tim Joyce. I'm a subsistence
25 biologist for the Forest Service and along side me is
26 Steve Zemke, he also works for subsistence in Anchorage.
27 I'm going to be making a presentation on the Cordova
28 Ranger District and Steve will be covering the rest of
29 the forest, which is the other side of the Sound and down
30 toward Seward. This will be short and brief. There's
31 some pictures involved. It doesn't require any
32 deliberations or any decisions, this is just a sit back
33 and relax and enjoy the show.

34

35 UNIDENTIFIED: Bless your heart.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Informational only,
38 right?

39

40 MR. JOYCE: Informational only, yes.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

43

44 MR. JOYCE: The Cordova Ranger District
45 is, we call this kind of the land of a million heart
46 beats, and there's probably more than that when you come
47 right down to it, you know, with all the birds and
48 everything that are here, but it is a very productive
49 area, as you are well aware, for salmon fisheries. And
50 we have several projects that are ongoing, both

00360

1 subsistence and otherwise, on the forest and I'm going to
2 run through those briefly and give you an idea of what's
3 going on. Some of these projects are ones that you've
4 approved for funding, some of them are ones that are
5 being run directly through Forest Service funds.

6

7 One of the projects that we're having, or
8 we do, is called a Lower Copper River Test Fishery. This
9 project is a cooperative project between the Native
10 Village of Eyak, the Forest, and the Department of Fish
11 and Game. These funds all are kind of, there's a variety
12 of different funds that are applied to this project
13 besides, I know that one of the issues brought up earlier
14 was trying to stretch the dollars and this is a good
15 example of that where we have many sources of funds going
16 into this.

17

18 The idea of this project is to get a
19 rough impression of what's entering the river for sockeye
20 salmon before they get to the sonar counter. As maybe
21 you may or may not be aware, generally it is a four to
22 seven day travel time from the Fishery up to the sonar
23 counter. And so, trying to coordinate the Fishery as
24 well as the counts for the subsistence upriver users can
25 be difficult at times if you have a seven day lag in
26 there. You're a week later before you actually know
27 what's happened in the fishery. So, this is an idea or
28 one of the methods being used to try to find out there is
29 a little sooner time period we can come up with.

30

31 What was being done was a gillnet, a very
32 short gillnet was being drifted in the river in a certain
33 area below mile 27 to see if there's fish in the river.
34 And, also, there was another sonar that was being used, a
35 small sonar unit that was established to look at whether
36 fish are going by. Obviously, the more accurate method
37 was with the sonar, you get a little tighter confidence,
38 but it's also more expensive.

39

40 The next project is called a Chinook
41 Salmon Escapement Monitoring. This is another project
42 that was being administered by the Native Village of Eyak
43 and as LGL the co-investigator. This is what I call the
44 mother of all fish wheels. This is really an impressive
45 fish wheel. You have to really stand along side it to
46 get an idea of just how big this is, but, it does a very
47 good job. The idea behind this project is to capture
48 chinook salmon. This is shortly after they pass the
49 sonar counter. The sonar counter does not differentiate
50 between salmon species, it just counts. So, trying to

00361

1 find out how many chinook salmon are going up the river
2 another method needed to be employed and that's capturing
3 these fish, tagging them with some sort of either a radio
4 tag or a spaghetti tag of some sort, releasing them live
5 back into the water, and then recapturing up river.
6 There's another fish wheel. There's two fish wheels in
7 the lower river and there's one fish wheel in the upper
8 river that recaptures these fish to come up with a mark
9 recapture estimate. This is the third year of this
10 project, this summer was the third year of this project.
11 These, both of these projects are one that you both of,
12 the Council has approved for funding in past years.
13

14 This is the -- oh, it's not running,
15 that's too bad. I guess I didn't load that part. There
16 we go. There's a Miles Lake sonar comparison study that
17 was done this summer. As I said, on most sonars you can
18 only see a little line on a graph that tells you there
19 was a fish going by. New technology out today, this is
20 one that was tried this summer at Miles Lake for just a
21 short period of time, you actually see the fish swim by.
22 There's no more, well, is this line a bubble or is it a
23 stick that's floating by. You can actually see and it
24 will count fish and this new technology will also allow
25 you to measure the fish as to how thick it is. So,
26 there's potential there to start making a determination
27 of species based upon thickness. I'm not saying that's
28 ready yet, but the potential may be there for that kind
29 of a project.
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, is that computer
32 enhanced graphics, you know, like I have a mild version
33 like that on my boat where it draws a picture of a fish
34 as it goes across?
35

36 MR. JOYCE: Those are actual fish.
37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are these actual....
39

40 MR. JOYCE: Those are actual fish
41 swimming by.
42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I mean, but these are
44 actual sonar bounce offs.....
45

46 MR. JOYCE: Yes.
47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:that show the
49 tail.....
50

00362

1 MR. JOYCE: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:wagging in that
4 way?

5

6 MR. JOYCE: Yes.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not a computer
9 enhanced graphic?

10

11 MR. JOYCE: No, this is an actual fish.
12 I'm not trying to pull the fish over your eyes here.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Where do I get one like
15 that? That looks like fun.

16

17 MR. JOYCE: I could even count these
18 fish.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah.

21

22 MR. JOYCE: I mean, that's something I
23 could do.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And that's going over
26 the substraight right there.

27

28 MR. JOYCE: This is one of the
29 technologies that was being investigated. There is some
30 drawbacks with it in that it is range limited. In dirty
31 water it does have a shorter range than some of the other
32 technologies that's out there, but it does do a very good
33 job of seeing what's there. You can actually put it over
34 a rock substraight and you can see the rocks and you can
35 see the fish swim from rock to rock as they go
36 by. It's very interesting.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, this wasn't used --
39 this is a comparison. This wasn't -- this isn't the one
40 that was used at the Miles Lake sonar.....

41

42 MR. JOYCE: No.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE:site?

45

46 MR. JOYCE: No.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This is one that was
49 used for experimental purposes?

50

00363

1 MR. JOYCE: This was -- there was -- the
2 current system that's there is a Bendix (ph) system.
3 It's about 30 years old. There's only one person in the
4 world that can work on it and he's about 80 years old.
5 So, we're looking at probably needing to replace that
6 soon. Not to be morbid. But, as again, the new
7 technology that's out there, this is brand new. This is
8 just recent on the market and the other stuff is split
9 beam sonar, different things like that, can count up or
10 down. This you can see, actually see. This is a 96 beam
11 sonar, it's not two beams, it's 96 beams, dual frequency,
12 and you can actually see fish with it.
13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What is it's range?
15

16 MR. JOYCE: This, I believe, is about 15
17 to 18 meters in dirty water. Now, that's something you
18 can deal with by putting a fence up close to shore,
19 forcing the fish off the shore a little bit, so that
20 they're more compacted so you can extend your range a
21 little bit that way. There's other things you might be
22 able to do offshore, too, to extend that range a little
23 bit.
24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, basically what you
26 have is you've got a 15 to 18 meter band of fish that you
27 can count with that?
28

29 MR. JOYCE: Yes.
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, on a that size
32 stream you could count the whole stream?
33

34 MR. JOYCE: Yes.
35

36 MR. ELVSAAS: Is this in muddy water?
37

38 MR. JOYCE: This is what it looks like on
39 the Copper River. This is not a particular picture of
40 the Copper River, but I was there when they had it on the
41 Copper River, it looks identical to this.
42

43 This is the Miles Lake Sonar Substraight.
44 This was a project that was funded through Forest Service
45 and originally way back when it first got started back
46 in, I guess, when OSM was getting started with all this
47 funding projects. This was about \$190,000 project to
48 replace the concrete substraight. I don't have a good
49 picture on this slide to show you exactly the dimensions
50 of that. This was taken from the bridge. It's a rather

00364

1 large piece of concrete. As you can well know, the
2 Copper River is pretty dynamic, it's pretty strong,
3 there's lots of icebergs that come down and can do
4 considerable damage to a lightweight structure, if you
5 will. The old substraight is right there, it's kind of
6 slightly covered in snow. Again, 30 years old and it's
7 pretty well demolished. It's not much left to be used.
8 There's a rail on this that's used for sliding the sonar
9 up and down the river bank as the water levels change.
10 Again, this was a cooperative project with the U. S.
11 Forest Service and the State of Alaska and hopefully this
12 will improve our sonar counting in the future. It
13 certainly will make life easier for those that operate
14 it.

15

16 One of the other projects that was funded
17 by the OSM and through this Council's approval was a
18 hooligan subsistence harvest project, and we were out
19 doing krill surveys this year on hooligan users. This
20 was again another project that was a cooperation between
21 the U. S. Forest Service and the Native Village of Eyak.
22 And I want to stress that the Native Village of Eyak was
23 also putting in other funds. Not only yours, but some
24 other funds, you know, their fish biologists are paid by
25 other funds. They were, you know, using some of their
26 own funds for paying for some of these operations, so
27 again, we're stretching dollars as was mentioned earlier.

28

29

30 The first part of this project was a
31 survey of households in Cordova, Chenega, and Tatitlek as
32 to what there uses of hooligan were, how many they would
33 normally use, and places they would go to catch them, and
34 how much sharing was there going on. This project here
35 was now to look at those users now and try to get an
36 idea, okay, what's the use now today compared to what it
37 was when we took these surveys, you know, in the
38 community profile data base several years ago.

39

40 Some of the other projects, these are not
41 related to subsistence so much as being funded by the
42 subsistence OSM, but these are other projects going on in
43 the forest. We have fish passes that operate, four
44 different ones within Prince William Sound, and we also
45 stock some lakes around the area with Native cutthroat
46 trout, and that is by capturing small cutthroat of this
47 size here, for example, and stocking them in the lakes
48 that either had or no longer have or don't have cutthroat
49 trout in them to allow for other recreational uses.

50

00365

1 We also have some restoration projects
2 that are ongoing. For example, the one on the right is a
3 road that has been abandoned, no longer in use, and we
4 removed the culverts and pulled the bank back a little
5 bit to stabilize the bank to allow a passage through that
6 area. We also have some, what you would call I guess, a
7 dammed kind of structure, I guess a levy, to reduce the
8 cutting of a stream. This is a stream that was elevated
9 in the '64 earthquake. It's got a rather large lake
10 behind it, but because of the change and the morphology
11 of the ground in the '64 quake, the stream has been
12 cutting, and cutting, and cutting on the stream bed and
13 it's draining the lake. And this lake has sockeye, has
14 cutthroat, and dolly varden in it, and the idea here is
15 to attempt to stop that stream cutting so that it will
16 maintain the lake level.

17
18 We're also doing some research projects.
19 This particular one has to do with a rainbow and
20 cutthroat trout distribution and they're hybrids. We're
21 finding there are both rainbow and cutthroat trout that
22 will interbreed, and we're getting hybrids that look
23 similar to a cutthroat trout, they lack slashes, or they
24 might look somewhat like a rainbow trout but they're not
25 really all the way there. And so, we're finding that
26 that's rather common out on the Delta. But, some places
27 in the Sound, on the islands for example, that it's not
28 real common, they are pretty well a pure strain. So,
29 that's one of the projects that's going on.

30
31 And, another research project that we had
32 was just how the influence of fall spawning salmon on the
33 growth and productivity of coho, juvenile coho that are
34 rearing in beaver ponds on the Delta. And this was very
35 interesting in that we found that coho not only utilized
36 the carcasses, you know as the fish comes up and spawns and
37 dies, you know, and you have bits of material from the
38 fish that's available for food, as well as the nutrients
39 that are added to the system, but they also feed quite a
40 bit on the row itself. You know, as eggs that are laid
41 that are not deposited in gravel that are drifting, coho
42 will utilize those quite a bit, and it's actually a very
43 important food source for them in the fall for growth.
44 We also found that flooding conditions are very, very
45 useful for coho, juvenile coho, in that they move into
46 that flooded area and feed a lot on the terrestrial
47 insects, not only on the aquatic, but on the terrestrial
48 insects that are there, and you get tremendous growth at
49 that point.

50

00366

1 And, finally, in closing, the finding of
2 the Forest plan in 2002, which was this year, directed
3 the Chugach National Forest to provide a beneficial mix
4 of resource uses and opportunities that provide for
5 public needs while promoting ecosystem health and
6 conservation. This plan will protect subsistence uses
7 now and into the future as the emphasis on fish and
8 wildlife habitat will help maintain plentiful resources.
9 The Cordova Ranger District, along with its partners and
10 the cooperative supporting research, restoration, and
11 enhancement projects, is doing its part to meet those
12 needs.

13

14 And that will conclude my part of the
15 presentation and I will now give this over to Mr. Zemke
16 and he can talk to you about the other half.

17

18 MR. ZEMKE: Actually, I'm going to have
19 to go off to a new file, so this will be just a second
20 here. Well, thank you Tim, Mr. Chair, the rest of the
21 Council. My name is Steve Zemke on Chugach National
22 Forest. I'll be discussing other projects on two other
23 ranger districts, the Seward Ranger District and the
24 Glacier Ranger District. I'll probably start with
25 Glacier Ranger District projects.

26

27 As you know, there's the Coghill Weir
28 Enumeration Project. This was a project that was
29 originally brought before the Council back in the year
30 2000 and it was funded during that period of time. And
31 it's a cooperative project with ADF&G Sport Fish Division
32 and the Forest Service. And there's counts for sockeye
33 salmon, and this year there was 28,000, which met or was
34 actually above the optimum escapement level and so the
35 season was expanded. Actually, the bag limit was
36 increased to 12 sockeyes per flight or opportunity,
37 additional opportunities. There were 22,000 plus pinks.

38

39

40 And then the coho, that was basically
41 kind of the portion of the Forest Service OSM funding for
42 the project, was expand the weir top run timing in that
43 system until through the run of coho salmon, which has
44 been somewhat problematic in that each year it's blown
45 out. In fact it did blow out again this year. In fact
46 it was lost two weeks ago and then went south for some
47 major numbers of coho swim by. For example, we had seven
48 inches of rain in the Coghill system in 24 hours. That's
49 not that unusual for Prince William Sound, but at the
50 same time, it's enough to lose the weir.

00367

1

2 And so there was a backup mark recapture system
3 initiated this year to kind of test to see what could be
4 done with that. And it was again, back up mark and
5 capture for the weir. As the fish were passing upstream
6 from the weir marked one in seven coho. The idea was to
7 try to recapture as many fish that were marked. We don't
8 actually have the total number that were marked on the
9 weir upstream, but during the recapture period which was
10 done last week there was 294 coho were recaptured, and of
11 those fish about one in 18 were marked. So, there was
12 actually a significantly larger number of fish it appears
13 that are up in the system that were counted through that
14 weir. So, you know, a minimum escapement level would
15 probably be 4,000.

16

17 And one of the reason why Coghill system
18 may be important is it probably doesn't get fished that
19 heavily right now, but there's been major concern,
20 particularly from the Village of Tatitlek, or not
21 Tatitlek, Chenega about the potential impact of the
22 Whittier Tunnel, which was recently opened up to
23 vehicular traffic. And though the numbers haven't come
24 out to what the State originally predicted there's a
25 significant increase. And, so, one of the ideas is to
26 get more information to be able to see whether or not
27 there's enough fish to meet people's needs.

28

29 Another project that was originally
30 initiated through the OS and FIS process was the hooligan
31 study on 20 Mile River, and that was also done in the
32 year 2000. And, in fact, that portion of the funding is
33 complete, but there was additional funding that was
34 secured through Forest Service and National Marine
35 Fisheries dollars to be able to expand the study
36 somewhat. Kind of the objectives for the hooligan study
37 was to kind of to determine the run timing and the
38 spawning run timing, to determine the presence and
39 absence in a neighboring system, such as the Placer River
40 and Portage Creek, to take a look at the life history of
41 the fish within the system, characterize and map the
42 critical habitats within the 20 Mile River system and
43 then develop a larval fish index to monitor fish
44 populations. As you may not know, the 20 Miles system is
45 a highly turbulent system and again, it's a system that
46 would be hard to count hooligan, and we're looking at
47 various methodologies to be able to try to use, to be
48 able to maybe take a look at developing some in the sea
49 methods to take along that we can use to get long term
50 trend information as the Council chair has brought up

00368

1 several times.

2

3 And the other one that we did this year
4 was kind of evaluate the use patterns for subsistence
5 recreation users in the 20 Mile system. Obviously, it's
6 right close to Anchorage, and that system is heavily used
7 by people of Anchorage, but it does actually get a fair
8 number of row users there. We're looking at those
9 developments for the year 2002.

10

11 This year was really the largest hooligan
12 run on the 20 Mile in the three years it's been looked
13 at. It was probably in excess of several hundred
14 thousand. Another thing we're looking at is how long the
15 adult retention time, you know, whether they'd be
16 available to fish, and it's like four days for females
17 and five days for males. They looked at life histories
18 within the system and most of the fish in the area were
19 age three. And here's a graph showing that looking at
20 the kind of the run dates in June and kind of the lower
21 two bars that you can see are age three and age four and
22 they make up the predominant composition of the fish.

23

24 Finally, the kind of larval fish in the
25 sea method does look like it's a promising method and
26 essentially there, they basically take tows at top,
27 middle, and lower water, take a look at drifting
28 juveniles. And here's a graph comparing the larval fish
29 in the sea to an actual adult catch breeding effort and
30 they track really very well. And that's kind of where
31 NPS' got involved with the process. They're looking at
32 being able to take a look at applying that through
33 various systems throughout not only Southcentral but in
34 Southeast Alaska.

35

36 You look like you have a question, there,
37 Ralph.

38

39 MR. LOHSE: Yeah, the larval, are they
40 last year's or this year's?

41

42 MR. ZEMKE: No, actually, if you look at
43 the run timing of adults are from, the line goes from
44 April 17 through June 16, and then the larval counts are
45 from June 5 through July 31, so they're actually.....

46

47 MR. LOHSE: So, they're this year's
48 hatch?

49

50 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, they're about an eight

00369

1 week lag there between the two runs.

2

3 MR. LOHSE: Okay. So that's -- you're
4 not superimposing two different years?

5

6 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah.

7

8 MR. LOHSE: You're still proposing the
9 same year.

10

11 MR. ZEMKE: I'm kind of....

12

13 MR. LOHSE: One more question.

14

15 MR. ZEMKE: Oh, sure.

16

17 MR. LOHSE: So, the larval goes out to
18 sea then, and then, how -- these are free drifting
19 larval?

20

21 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah, free drifting. They've
22 hatched and they're free drifting out into Turnagain Arm,
23 Cook Inlet, and they come back in in primarily three's
24 and four's.

25

26 MR. LOHSE: So, they have no life history
27 in the river itself?

28 MR. ZEMKE: No.

29

30 MR. LOHSE: They actually just....

31

32 MR. ZEMKE: Just that drift period.

33

34 MR. LOHSE: Just that drift period?

35

36 MR. ZEMKE: Yeah. Just kind of shifting
37 gears, one of the things that the Forest was involved
38 with was establishing subsistence fishing permits for the
39 primarily Kenai Peninsula, and there was anticipated that
40 there would be a fair amount of requests for those, and
41 actually there was nobody that came into any of the
42 Forest Service offices and requested a permit. And
43 talking with the Fish and Wildlife Service there was two
44 from the Fisheries Resource Office in Soldotna.

45

46 MS. WELLS: Permits for?

47

48 MR. ZEMKE: For subsistence fishing.

49

50 MS. WELLS: For hooligan?

00370

1 MR. ZEMKE: No, this is for all fish in
2 the Kenai Peninsula. And, those are kind of the primary
3 funded projects on the Chugach, not including Cordova,
4 but there's also quite a few other projects that were
5 funded through other sources. And there was kind of coho
6 and sockeye foot surveys in eight small streams within
7 Prince William Sound and the Kenai Peninsula, and that's
8 trying to establish some baseline data to take a look at
9 kind of maybe potentially developing some area under the
10 curve estimates later on to provide some index to poorer
11 streams scattered through the systems throughout the
12 forest.

13
14 There was kind of distribution and
15 abundance on four streams of those eight for those. They
16 also got distribution in abundance for primarily sockeye
17 and coho, but also for cutthroat trout. And then Prince
18 William Sound has a whole network of fish passages that
19 were structures that were done back, completed primarily
20 back in the late '70's and '80's and they've been in the
21 system for 15 to 20 years and they are really starting to
22 fall into disrepair, so they're been a major effort to be
23 able to go in and upgrade the structures and get them to
24 where they'll withstand a few more years of the heavy
25 flows within the system.

26
27 And then there's a Soft Lake sockeye
28 systems that was one of the fishways that was put in and
29 then through EVO's funding there's been money secured to
30 be able to stock sockeye within that system kind of in
31 conjunction with the needs for the Village of Chenega.
32 That's potentially one of their major sockeye subsistence
33 fishing sites.

34
35 And then on the Seward Ranger District
36 there hasn't been many projects, but there was the Seward
37 Moose Pass Wild Resource Harvest Use Survey. It's part
38 of the statewide community profile databases. And on the
39 Kenai Peninsula Seward Moose Pass was the one major
40 community that didn't have a community profile database
41 study done on it. Kenai and Moose -- Sterling, Cooper
42 Landing, Hope, you know, Soldotna, Ninilchik, Seldovia,
43 they all had community profile studies but Seward didn't,
44 so the Forest Service became involved with the ADF&G
45 Department of Subsistence to go in and coop the project
46 to be able to collect the data.

47
48 And it's got four primary emphasis. One
49 is to provide demographic information on communities in
50 Seward and Moose Pass. Two is to kind of provide

00371

1 economic data, kind of what's the economic structure of
2 the community. Three was to provide harvest and resource
3 information, how much fish do they use, how much moose,
4 how much sheep, examples. And then finally it's kind of
5 what are the locations and use patterns of those harvest
6 activities. And that publication is currently in draft
7 and should be out by the end of this year. A copy will
8 be provided for the Council when that's out.

9

10 So, that's kind of a quick overview of the kind
11 of subsistence related activities. And as Tim had
12 mentioned, there's a newly completed revised Forest and
13 Land Management Plan that's been brought before the
14 Council several different times. And the actual record
15 of decision was signed in May and went into the Federal
16 Register and it went through the 30 day period there, and
17 so it was actually formally out in July of 2002 of this
18 year. And so, there's a 90 day appeal period. The
19 appeal period is over in the middle of this month. But,
20 it actually, when it went through the Federal Register
21 it's actually been formally adopted.

22

23 And I've given each one of you a copy and
24 there's a CD copy here of the EIS maps and the Forest
25 plan. Obviously if you don't have a CD drive you can put
26 it on right now and open it up. But then also included
27 in your package, kind of an executive summary of that
28 information on here. And there is a copy of the record
29 of decision. And the revised Forest Land Management Plan
30 and the -- also after that I'll just briefly describe the
31 schedule of proposed action.

32

33 So, the Forest and Land Management Plan
34 objectives really quickly. One, it emphasizes natural
35 processes across the forest. And essentially that means
36 that there isn't a lot of developmental activities such
37 as commercial forest harvest, large scale launch
38 development, and that kind of thing that's planned for
39 the forest. One of the things that was a major concern
40 for subsistence users would be to maintain access, either
41 motorized and non-motorized access across the forest, and
42 those access points are guaranteed completely across the
43 forest.

44

45 Tim mentioned the Forest's emphasis is on
46 management for sustainable ecological systems and then
47 for management of fish and wildlife habitat, and that
48 would include those enhanced restoration projects that
49 may be key to continuing providing for huntable and
50 fishable populations of fish and wildlife.

00372

1 Recreation development I think was a
2 concern for a lot of people and it emphasizes undeveloped
3 recreation across most of the forest. We're not looking
4 at developing large scale lodge development and
5 commercial recreation use. And then there's the network
6 of wilderness areas, wild scenic rivers, and research
7 natural areas. Probably one of the key controversial
8 areas was the east Copper River Delta originally, and the
9 preferred alternative that was recommended was
10 wilderness.

11
12 There are several people, groups,
13 particularly here in Cordova, such as Cordova Fishermen's
14 United, and then also I think the Native Village of Eyak,
15 Eyak Corporation, and several other groups had concerns
16 about establishing wilderness in the area. One of the
17 major conflicts is potentially what would wilderness do
18 with being able to potentially close the area down to
19 commercial fishing or subsistence uses such as like in
20 Glacier Bay. And so, that was a major concern. So that
21 was changed over to a new prescription. It is similar to
22 wilderness but it doesn't have the wilderness designation
23 that would allow for wildlife enhancement projects such
24 as projects for moose or designated Canada goose, but
25 also for current commercial fish usages and that thing,
26 that manner.

27
28 And finally, there is active management
29 as we call it, selected locations, and that's primarily
30 around a road corridor, such on Kenai Peninsula.
31 Primarily there would be to take a look at needs to
32 stands that have been heavily impacted by the Spruce Bark
33 Beetle. Potentially it could include mechanical
34 treatments or there were maybe some proposed prescribed
35 burning, though that's been put on hold, particularly
36 with the one prescribed burn that was on Kenai Peninsula
37 in 2001 that escaped. So there was a major management
38 review of that one, and then kind of the fire history
39 year 2000 and 2002 for the rest of the nation has kind of
40 put a, let's look and see before we get too far ahead on a
41 prescribed burning program. But that is still, would be
42 advanced in the future and you probably would see it on
43 that schedule of proposed action. And if you want to
44 take a look at the other idea -- issues that are related
45 to the revision there's a website. The CD you have is
46 actually on that website and there's some other
47 information that you could look and get on that.

48
49 And, here's an example, here's the actual
50 final forest land management plan with various colors.

00373

1 And kind of the lighter colors means that that's kind of
2 tending toward natural process, where kind of light
3 prescription on the land kind of management for fish and
4 wildlife habitat and maintaining ecological integrity.
5 Some of the darker ones, the darker browns are more maybe
6 focus more on act of management, and as you see where
7 it's talking about along the road corridor, you can see
8 the road that winds through the Kenai Peninsula there's
9 that brown stripe through there, and that would be
10 primarily where the active management processes would be
11 -- or programs would be taking place.

12

13 Now, kind of lastly is a schedule of
14 proposed actions. That's a -- I think it's a ten page
15 handout I have given you that provides kind of
16 information on the potential projects that are going on
17 on the Chugach and included in that schedule would be a
18 project title, it's somewhat explanatory, it would be a
19 program, or project location, where it's located on the
20 forest, kind of a description of the work contemplated,
21 whether it's a campground or fish passage restoration
22 project, a fish restoration program examples. Status of
23 the environmental analysis, whether scoping has been
24 done, whether there is a need the document being prepared
25 when it was anticipated, kind of the decision date and
26 the responsibility of the official, whether which Ranger
27 district is responsible for the project. And then
28 finally, a contact person if you have questions about the
29 project there would be a person you can contact in the
30 Ranger district or Supervisor's office to get more
31 information.

32

33 So, and then this thing is for the first
34 quarter and it's updated usually quarterly, but it's
35 behind schedule now and it should be -- the third quarter
36 update should be out soon and it will be on this website
37 if you have that, or if you like we could send you a hard
38 copy through the mail.

39

40 So, that's all I have. Are there any
41 questions for myself or Tim?

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, you mentioned there
46 were 9 fish passages that were in need of repair. Are
47 those proceeding well, does funding seem adequate to make
48 those things happen?

49

50 MR. ZEMKE: Funding is usually adequate.

00374

1 Some years some of it may have to be deferred to another
2 year, but we prioritize them and the ones of higher
3 priority have been treated first. There's also, they're
4 put on a capital program, and so, with the bureaucracy it
5 is sometimes hard to make sure they get advanced far
6 enough through the capital program to go. But they are
7 usually ranked high in the priority basis of the projects
8 that would be funded through the Forest Fish Program.
9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: And what kind of fish
11 stocks are primary fish stocks that those concern?
12

13 MR. ZEMKE: There's a variety of fish
14 stocks. Again, like Soft Lake was an example, that was
15 sockeye, though coho do also go up in the system. There
16 are some pinks fish passage structures that were done
17 earlier, but then there's the newer structures of Billy's
18 -- or not, Otter Lake was an example, and that's
19 primarily for coho but there are a few sockeye. So it's
20 a variety of species.
21

22 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much,
23 Steve.
24

25 MR. ZEMKE: If you'd like, I could
26 provide you a more detailed analysis of those later on if
27 you'd.....
28

29 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll give you a call when
30 I get back to town.
31

32 MR. ZEMKE: Certainly.
33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you, Steve.
35 Anybody else have any questions?
36

37 (No audible response)
38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.
40

41 MR. ZEMKE: Okay. Thank you very much.
42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Very nice presentation.
44 And, how much does that sonar cost that Joyce pitched?
45

46 UNIDENTIFIED: It's expensive.
47

48 UNIDENTIFIED: What's the brand?
49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Can we get a grant to

00375

1 try one on our fishing boats?

2

3 UNIDENTIFIED: About 8,000.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Boy.

6

7 Thank you. With that we have in this
8 section here, we still have the Cook Inlet Subsistence
9 Fisheries Update by Pat and am I missing something?

10

11 (No audible response)

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We already had the
14 Partners for Fisheries Monitoring, right?

15

16 (No audible response)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the streamline and
19 special action, right?

20

21 (No audible response)

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So we are on the Cook
24 Inlet Subsistence Fisheries Update and we're going to try
25 to get that done and the National Park Service done
26 before lunch. And maybe we can -- no, I don't see Elijah
27 here, he must be out fishing.

28

29 UNIDENTIFIED: No, I'm here.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We're going to save you
32 for last so you have to stay an extra day. And I think
33 that's in our book on page 283 or something like that.
34 Yeah, 283.

35

36 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
37 Again, for the record, this is Pat Petrivelli,
38 anthropologist for the Southcentral Region and the
39 summary of the draft investigation plan is under tab H,
40 page 283.

41

42 This project was funded as a result of
43 the Federal Board deferring the decision on the proposal
44 last December concerning the C&T determinations for the
45 Cook Inlet area, and they felt they needed more
46 information, so they directed that this study be
47 undertaken. And we entered into a cooperative agreement
48 with the ADF&G Division of Subsistence, and there it was
49 funded through an 809 agreement directly for this first
50 phase, and then the second page, it became part of the

00376

1 FIS program.

2

3 So the first phase, and with the F, it
4 has the budget with the 2002 being the 33,787 and that's
5 the first phase that's going until December of this year,
6 and then the next phase starts in January, but that's FY
7 2003 funds. The objectives of this project is to gather
8 information, and they're listed on page 283, about
9 potential community harvest levels and use patterns for
10 the stocks under consideration, and then to explore the
11 affects that the regulatory closures of subsistence
12 fishing for salmon in fresh water since 1952 because
13 we're faced with an unique situation.

14

15 In past instances the Federal Board made
16 subsistence fisheries regulations based upon past
17 subsistence regulations in existence in the State system,
18 but the State has not -- subsistence fishing has not been
19 allowed in fresh water stream on the Kenai Peninsula
20 since 1952 and it has all been in marine waters or at the
21 mouth of rivers in State waters. As it has been
22 mentioned before, the State has made a non-subsistence
23 area in that region since early '90's.

24

25 And then another objective of the study
26 is to identify the issues and concerns about users of
27 these resources. Since these fisheries are fully
28 allocated and as we have a reintroduction of subsistence
29 fisheries in this area, we'd like to involve as many
30 users as possible. And, so, the first phase of the study
31 was just to make the plan as how to approach this. And
32 then part of that plan is to conduct scoping meetings,
33 and we're having five of those, and like Polly mentioned,
34 the first one will be October 8 in Cooper Landing and
35 then the second one is scheduled for Anchorage sometime
36 the week of October 21, possibly the 23 and 24. And then
37 the last three will be done in November, but the last
38 three will be in Kenai, Ninilchik, and Seldovia.

39

40 And our goal in those scoping meetings is
41 to help develop the research instrument that will be used
42 in doing household surveys. We'll be -- when we do the
43 household surveys we will only be surveying rural
44 residents, but as we gather about and -- whenever we
45 undertake household surveys we'd like to, in the interest
46 of cost efficiency and then in minimal harassment of
47 people who have to answer questions, try to get the best
48 information and as much information as possible. But
49 we'll be investigating two questions, past use and then
50 future use. So, it is unique in that we'll be asking

00377

1 about future use. Usually that's usually not a question
2 we ask. Most subsistence household surveys in the past
3 just talk about past use and this year's harvest
4 assessment. But, the harvest assessment now, like is
5 pointed out on the Kenai, it's always occurred under
6 sport, personal use, or commercial. And so, subsistence
7 use in the Kenai freshwater areas is impossible.

8

9 And, actually, I should back up a little.

10 The areas we'll be looking at will not only be on the
11 Kenai Peninsula, but on the west side of Cook Inlet, so
12 we will be looking at those Federal waters that are
13 included in the Lake Clark National Park, but not any
14 further north. We're not going to all the Federal waters
15 of Cook Inlet, but just the west side of Cook Inlet and
16 Lake Clark National Park, and then the Kenai Peninsula.
17 So, all the Federal waters on the Kenai Peninsula.

18

19 And, so, and once those scoping meetings
20 are done and those scoping meetings are just a limited
21 list of invited participants, and then -- but then the
22 Division will take that information and develop the
23 household surveys and then relook at the investigation
24 plan because it's not -- we haven't -- we know that it
25 will be necessary for a certain number of key interviews,
26 key respondent interviews where they'll be in-depth. And
27 we'll be in the process of trying to identify those
28 individuals that have those in-depth interviews. But,
29 what the mix will be, whether it's the -- over the
30 household surveys they're is approximately 5,800 rural
31 residents in the area in question and how we go about
32 surveying them is still -- we're still determining that.
33 But that would start sometime in the spring and the
34 schedule is on page 286.

35

36 And, so, those interviewing would be
37 February, March, and then event- -- the end of the
38 project would be December 2002, and -- 2003, excuse me.
39 And then once that project -- or once that's done, how
40 the results are reviewed with the public and the other
41 user groups will probably be through the Regional Council
42 meetings or other -- in previous talks the idea of round-
43 table discussions, but it is anticipated then the Board
44 would make a decision about the Cook Inlet Fisheries in
45 December of 2004.

46

47 So, if you have any questions.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

50

00378

1 MR. CHURCHILL: I'm kind of curious,
2 could you fill in a little more detail about how you
3 might approach your questions regarding future use? Are
4 they just going to be put into the context if we were to
5 go back to an active subsistence fishery what would your
6 take be, or, could you give me a little more information
7 about that?

8
9 MS. PETRIVELLI: With the future use,
10 part of it is it was just to -- because it's such a
11 different issue, that's kind of -- it's like that what
12 if, you know. We haven't done questionnaires like that
13 and that's why we're doing these scoping design meetings.
14 So, but we would want to gather information about -- and
15 people are aware of the existing conditions in the rivers
16 and areas, so I think the phrasing would be of
17 identifying subsistence needs and as it would relate to
18 what regulations would be needed to be made about limits,
19 seasons, timing, location, or methods. So, but, we're
20 not exactly sure how they'll be asked.

21
22 MR. CHURCHILL: So, if I'm understanding
23 correctly, the context of the question is, for the
24 individual answering the question to project what amounts
25 they would reasonably need for subsistence and then tell
26 you what their future needs would be, so it's kind of
27 trying to get at that reasonable needs for subsistences,
28 is that right then?

29
30 MS. PETRIVELLI: Possibly, yeah.

31
32 MR. CHURCHILL: Possibly not?

33
34 MS. PETRIVELLI: Well, that's what we're
35 doing the meetings about. And I think we'd probably even
36 talk with the Protocol because they are addressing the
37 ideas of amounts necessary for subsistence and so -- but
38 just any kind of survey work. You know, we can have very
39 likely, likely, not likely, you know, we can have ranges
40 of amounts. I'm not exactly sure how we'll approach
41 getting the necessary information or what would be
42 needed.

43
44 MR. CHURCHILL: Who do you plan to have
45 do these interviews?

46
47 MS. PETRIVELLI: It's the Division of
48 Subsistence that has -- that will put together the team.
49 And they've carried out household surveys, like when they
50 did the Southern Cook Inlet, when they did the Ninilchik

00379

1 rural areas there was a team of five people involved in
2 that study. And Jim Fall hasn't identified the team yet
3 that will be doing that, but as we figure out the depth,
4 how large the survey would be and how many, whether it's
5 house to house and a whole census type, and the timing,
6 that will be part of that investigation plan developed in
7 December.

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: Have you been involving
10 the Advisory Committees, State Advisory Committees in
11 this process?

12

13 MS. PETRIVELLI: We've kept -- well, part
14 of Jim Fall's protocol is to inform who ever is involved
15 in a survey that the study is being undertaken, and I
16 know as we are doing these scoping meetings we've
17 contacted those committees throughout. One's, like
18 Cooper Landing is involved with the Cooper Landing one
19 and when we do the Kenai one we'll involve -- and
20 Ninilchik. So, they will be aware of the fact that we're
21 doing those, but, so, I think he's kept them informed,
22 but I'm not -- I haven't -- I'm pretty sure he has. And,
23 well, with the Anchorage one I'm not sure.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I think there has
26 been at least some contact with Anchorage, and I'd really
27 encourage you to do that because it's an area heavily and
28 traditionally used by the folks. But, at least the
29 feedback I've got is that there is at least some
30 involvement in the AC's and feedback I've gotten have
31 been real positive, they really appreciate that, Pat.

32

33 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yeah, I think -- well
34 that's part of -- with Jim Fall's Division of Subsistence
35 I'm not sure if that's part of the protocol to keep them
36 informed but I know he's done it for Cooper Landing.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
39 Pat?

40

41 (No audible response)

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Pat, if I understand
44 right, basically the questions for the interview and
45 stuff like that will come out of the needs that are
46 identified in the scoping project and at that point in
47 time -- the interview isn't decided on yet, you're in the
48 process of finding out what's needed and what it's going
49 to take to do it, right?

50

00380

1 MS. PETRIVELLI: Yes. As we are -- well,
2 because it's -- a lot of the survey instruments that have
3 been used before asked, you know, what subsistence
4 resources have you used, how have you harvested, where
5 have you harvested, and documenting the past use,
6 whatever years there are. Since subsistence fishing has
7 not been allowed since 1952 in the waters under question
8 we're faced with a different situation. So, that's why
9 we're trying to look at a way to frame the questions and
10 not create unrealistic expectations, also.

11
12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Because if
13 you ask what if people would say, well if I said what if
14 maybe that's what I'll get. Okay. 11:13, we've got 45
15 minutes yet. Let's see if we can get the National Park
16 taken care of because I think that they are hoping to
17 leave on the 12:00 o'clock plane, if possible. So, we're
18 finished with 14 aren't we? Did we miss any section of
19 14, Mr. Churchill?

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: No, no. I was just
22 waiving good bye.

23
24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, okay. Let's go on
25 to the National Park Service then under 14.3.

26
27 MS. SHARP: Devi Sharp, Wrangell-St.
28 Elias National Park. I have a very brief update. I
29 would like to comment on how thoughtful and philosophical
30 this group is. You guys are really a great Regional
31 Advisory Council. You put a lot of thought into things.

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED: Bye, Gabe.

34
35 UNIDENTIFIED: Take care, Gabe, see you
36 at home.

37
38 MS. SHARP: Wrangell-St. Elias has a new
39 visitor center and we're real -- we have a new visitor
40 center, administrative office, exhibit center, and
41 theater. It's in a village motif, so some of the
42 buildings are not winterized, so we can close down the
43 theater and the exhibit center. The visitor center is
44 open all year around and so are the administrative
45 offices. Anybody who is in the area we would love to
46 show it off and next time the Southcentral Regional
47 Advisory Council meets in the area we'd like to show it
48 off and take a quick field trip there to show you what we
49 have. I -- and that's it for P.R. for the Park.

50

00381

1 I do want to tell you about an action, a
2 closure action that the Park took just a few months ago.
3 There was a new, an illegal ATV trail that went from an
4 inholding on the Nabesna Road to Copper Lake. The trail
5 caused an unacceptable amount of environmental damage,
6 and even though it was access to inholdings there is
7 another feasible way to get to Copper Lake that we've
8 always considered to be the reasonable feasible access to
9 the lake, which is a float plane, and has been the
10 traditional access. And there still is an acceptable ATV
11 trail, it's not in good shape, but it's there.

12
13 In an effort to not permit the expansion of
14 illegal ATV trails or new ATV trails the park made a
15 closure, did it with the State, did it very carefully and
16 well throughout with the State and so far we're being
17 supported on that. And I think it's important for you to
18 know that we are trying to be careful environmental
19 stewards while still protecting access for both the
20 public and for subsistence uses and to private
21 inholdings. And it's a delicate balance and I think we
22 made a good judgment on that one.

23
24 We had a subsistence resource commission
25 meeting last week in Tok and the SRC directed the NPS
26 staff to write a proposal for the Board of Game to change
27 the State proposal for -- the State regulation for Unit
28 11 sheep from, it is now any ram, and they would like to
29 see it either three quarters curl or full curl. And we
30 will be flexible on that because we're working with the
31 State because the State, our local State Fish and Game
32 biologists would like to do something similar and we'll
33 go -- we'll take his lead on that so that we're more
34 successful.

35
36 The SRC also asked for proposal for
37 ceremonial taking of wildlife similar to the proposal
38 that we spoke about yesterday, Proposal 27. And Units 1
39 through 5 have the same language and they would like the
40 for Units 11 and 13, so you can expect that to come up,
41 and that will be a Federal proposal.

42
43 And, finally, the SRC will meet one week
44 prior to whenever you decide to meet, and we will meet in
45 the Copper Basin, probably at Tazlina Hall, and anybody
46 is always welcome. We would welcome some members from
47 the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council. And I'd like
48 to pass it on to Eric for the fisheries update.

49
50 MR. VEACH: Mr. Chairman, Regional

00382

1 Council, Eric Veach with Wrangell-St. Elias National
2 Park. What I'd like to do is just give you a brief
3 update on Federal management of subsistence fisheries in
4 the Copper River this summer, give you an update on some
5 of the fisheries project the Park is conducting, and then
6 I'd like to pass the mic to Dave Nelson who will give you
7 a status update on Proposal 19.

8

9 As I am sure all of you know this was the
10 first year that there was actually a Federal subsistence
11 fishing season in the Chitina subdistrict. And it was
12 also the first year that we issued Federal permits for
13 the Glennallen subdistrict. In the past, folks that have
14 fished in the Glennallen subdistrict have just used their
15 State permit to fish under Federal regulation. So, it
16 was definitely a little bit of a new twist to Federal
17 fisheries management in the Copper River this summer.

18

19 Also, as you remember, we were directed
20 by the Federal Subsistence Board to coordinate our
21 management of the Chitina subdistrict very closely with
22 the State of Alaska. And the Chitina subdistrict is
23 managed through periodic openings so the fishery is not
24 open continuously, it's an abundance based management.
25 Essentially, the open period is determined by the number
26 of fish that pass the sonar approximately two weeks prior
27 to when -- with the corresponding period on the Chitina
28 subdistrict.

29

30 We described this management approach to
31 you here at the spring meeting last year. I also just
32 wanted to mention that we presented this information at
33 the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission
34 meeting, also at a meeting with the Copper River Native
35 Association Villages, and we mailed an informational
36 sheet to over 700 households in the Copper Basin, and
37 then just prior to the opening of the fishing season we
38 also had a public meeting at our headquarters office in
39 Cooper Center. So, we've made quite an effort to get
40 this information out to folks and as near as we can tell
41 that worked well for us.

42

43 We also developed a computerized data
44 base so that when we issue our permits it is very similar
45 for those of you who get permits from the BLM for the
46 caribou hunt. We have a real similar system now for
47 Federal fish permits in the Copper Basin. You come into
48 the office, we take some basic information from you as
49 far as your name, address, driver's license number,
50 basically we tack this information into a form, it's

00383

1 printed out on your permit, at the same time it goes
2 directly in our data base. So, once you leave our office
3 with your permit that information is stored in the data
4 base, it can be accessed by anyone with access to our
5 computer server.

6

7 We issued 209 Glennallen subdistrict
8 permits, and we issued 123 Chitina subdistrict permits.
9 Nearly everyone who requested a Chitina subdistrict
10 permit also got a Glennallen subdistrict permit. There
11 certainly were some folks that have always fished in the
12 Glennallen subdistrict and were only interested in
13 continuing to do that and didn't request a Chitina
14 subdistrict permit. In the past, looking at the permits
15 that have been issued under the State system,
16 approximately 400 of the households who participate in
17 the State fishery have addresses that would make them
18 Federally qualified. So, roughly, looking at the numbers
19 here, probably about half of the households that are
20 Federally qualified came to us for a permit this year,
21 which considering it was the first year that we were
22 issuing Federal permits we felt pretty good about it.

23

24 There were three fish wheels that
25 operated in the Chitina subdistrict. As you probably
26 remember, this was the first year in a long time that
27 fish wheels were allowed to operate in the Chitina
28 subdistrict. I did observe three fish wheels actually
29 fishing down there, so we had a little bit of
30 participation with fish wheels.

31

32 I want to mention that we issued eight
33 special actions this year. And, again, we issued special
34 actions in coordination with State emergency orders. So,
35 when the State would issue an emergency order either
36 restricting the fishery to an open period or adjusting an
37 open period essentially we would mimic that action with a
38 special action on the Federal side so that the State and
39 Federal fisheries were open for exactly the same duration
40 this summer. At any time both fisheries were either
41 opened or closed.

42

43 MR. ELVSAAS: That was in the Chitina
44 subdistrict?

45

46 MR. VEACH: That was in the Chitina
47 subdistrict. And actually, in the Glennallen subdistrict
48 -- you know the Glennallen subdistrict remains open
49 continuously under both systems. The Federal system does
50 open about two weeks earlier on May 15 instead of June 1,

00384

1 but after June 1 essentially the seasons were open
2 exactly the same time in the Glennallen subdistrict as
3 well.

4

5 So, we issued one special action at the
6 start of the season to outline the preseason schedule and
7 then in season we issued three additional special actions
8 which decreased the existing anticipated opening periods
9 and we issued four special actions which increased the
10 open periods.

11

12 And the sonar counts got off to a little
13 bit of a slow start, kind of a few sputters, and then
14 toward the end of June they actually picked up and they
15 went above the anticipated counts, and in response to
16 that it was about July 15 the season remained open
17 continuously then for the remainder of the season.

18

19 There were approximately 819,000 fish
20 estimated by the Miles Lake sonar by July 31 when the
21 sonar was pulled. And, I guess just to give you a little
22 bit of a summary of our postseason evaluation, really we
23 felt like the season went well. You know, there
24 certainly have been some concerns when we've approached
25 this Council in the past as these regulations were
26 developed that we were going to see a tremendous amount
27 of conflict between folks, especially under State and
28 Federal regulations, and really as near as we could tell
29 that didn't arise. The three fish wheels that operated
30 in the Chitina subdistrict operated directly downstream
31 of the Chitina-McCarthy bridge on the east bank. That's
32 not an area that's typically heavily utilized by
33 dipnetters so there really wasn't much conflict between
34 the users, which I think says a lot for both user groups,
35 and we were certainly really excited that there wasn't a
36 lot of conflict down there.

37

38 Really we felt like the information went
39 out well. We, of course, issued press releases that
40 corresponded with each special action. As near as we
41 could tell the users seemed to get the information in a
42 timely manner. And, really, for all practical purposes,
43 again, as I said, you know, we avoided the conflicts and
44 with the exception of the folks that were fishing on the
45 three fish wheels in the Chitina subdistrict, for all
46 practical purposes the rest of the Federal users in the
47 Chitina subdistrict were practically invisible, you
48 really couldn't tell them apart from the folks that were
49 fishing under State regulations.

50

00385

1 With that, I'd like to move into just a
2 brief discussion of some of our projects. We're
3 continuing with our freshwater fish inventory project
4 throughout the Park. This year we also did about three
5 weeks of work in Yukon-Charley Rivers Preserve and we
6 spent the rest of the summer in the Wrangells and we
7 really feel like we're getting a pretty good handle now
8 on the drainages in the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park.
9 We probably have our field work there about wrapped up
10 and next summer we're moving up to Denali to do a
11 summer's worth of work up there.

12
13 We operated our weir in Tanada Creek
14 again. Actually, Doug McBride gave an excellent summary
15 of the objectives of that project earlier, so I won't go
16 over that again. I'll just mention we did count about
17 2,488 sockeyes through the Tanada Creek weir this year,
18 which is better than last year. Last year the number was
19 about 1,650. And what doesn't readily jump out either
20 with that number is that the water was extremely high
21 this year from about the end of May through about the
22 third week of June and it was really just too high to get
23 the weir in prior to the third week of June. And based
24 on kind of just some preliminary numbers we're seeing
25 from some mark and recapture work at the Tanada Lake
26 probably there was as many fish that went through in that
27 early June period as went through in the rest of the
28 summer. So, the population -- the escapement at Tanada
29 Lake was probably 5,000 or more fish.

30
31 One other just little thing I wanted to
32 mention, too, with that project is, we are -- what we're
33 looking at is we have a video camera system. We actually
34 have two video cameras that are pointed, they're
35 suspended above the stream channel and they're pointed at
36 the channel, and we essentially tape the fish as they
37 move upstream. Well, right now we're operating the weir,
38 and we're operating the video cameras at the same time,
39 and we're trying to develop and index between our video
40 counts and the weir counts so that in the future we can
41 go strictly to video counts, which will be much less
42 expensive, much less labor intensive than operating a
43 weir in that system. And that's some of the reason we
44 put in a request for an additional year of funding. I
45 think if we can get another year of data that'll help us
46 come up with that much better of an index there.
47 Certainly, again, the kind of preliminary results of the
48 video camera system seems to be working relatively well.
49 It certainly doesn't count every fish like we do with the
50 weir, but it does count a lot of fish well and the system

00386

1 seems to be working real well for us.

2

3 With that, I'd like to move on to just a
4 quick update of a cooperative project, it's the Copper
5 River Steelhead Harvest Monitoring Project. We performed
6 this project in cooperation with the Copper River Native
7 Association. And the objectives for this project are
8 just to get a very rough estimate of the amount of
9 steelhead harvest that occurs in the Copper River during
10 the two weeks that the Federal season is open in May
11 prior to when the State season opens. And, if you
12 remember a few years ago there were some concerns about
13 the impact of extending that Federal season might have on
14 steelhead.

15

16 Last year we didn't catch any steelhead.
17 This year we were successful in catching four. Again, we
18 found that it's difficult to operate those fish wheels
19 May 15. Most folks, they're, you know, May 15 there's
20 still a lot ice coming downstream, the access roads to
21 the fish wheel sites are still really muddy. So, it was
22 actually May 20 before we were able to get the fish
23 wheels in again this year. We did, like I said, catch
24 four steelhead between May 23 and May 30, and then we did
25 two flights of the river to count the number of fish
26 wheels that were operating. On May 20 we saw one wheel
27 actually fishing, five wheels were preparing to fish.
28 And on May 29 there were a few more, there were four
29 wheels that were fishing and another 13 wheels that were
30 either positioned in the water or getting ready to go
31 into the water. So, again, you can see the effort is not
32 real high in those last two weeks of May there.

33

34 Mr. Chair, that concludes my report. I'd
35 be happy to answer any questions.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

38

39 MR. ELVSAAS: On the Chitina subdistrict,
40 the fish wheels, it seems to me there was a lot of
41 concern last year about there being too many. Three
42 doesn't sound like too many to me, it sounds like a
43 pretty good operation. So, I think some of our fears of
44 a year ago are at least for this year out of the way.

45

46 MR. VEACH: I'd definitely agree.

47

48 MR. ELVSAAS: Yeah, that's great.

49 Thanks.

50

00387

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, if it's of any
4 help, the feedback I got from friends up in that area,
5 they were really excited, really pleased, particularly
6 with the fish wheels and felt it was a great effort on
7 everyone's part.

8

9 Another subject, what's the thought
10 behind the restriction on the sheep harvest? Is it a
11 conservation concern?

12

13 MS. SHARP: Yes, it is a conservation
14 concern. Unit 11 was any sheep, and it was one of the
15 only any sheep units in the State. And that's clearly in
16 contradiction to good conservation practices to take the
17 females out of the population. In some of the areas in
18 Unit 11 the trends for sheep are definitely going down.
19 Particularly, there's one of the things that protects
20 Unit 11 sheep is the lack of access. And the few places
21 that do have some access, either good road or fly-in
22 access in the Preserve, the numbers of sheep are going
23 down. And it's an effort to conserve the sheep
24 population. And the State has the same concern.

25

26 MR. CHURCHILL: Okay, thank you. Just
27 wanted to clarify that for the record.

28

29 MS. SHARP: Thank you.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have a few questions.
32 You said you were successful in catching four steelhead.
33 That means you were unsuccessful and you caught four
34 steelhead. We discussed getting some regulations or
35 power in place to get fish wheels off the river by a
36 certain time after the season, did anything ever come of
37 that?

38

39 (No audible response)

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So the fish wheels,
42 derelict fish wheels can still be stored anyplace along
43 the river bank?

44

45 (No audible response)

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

48

49 MS. SHARP: I believe that proposal died
50 for the inability to ever enforce it because of the lack

00388

1 of jurisdiction that anybody has in that.....

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

4

5 MS. SHARP:no-man zone of.....

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Of the river.

8

9 MS. SHARP:navigability.....

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

12

13 MS. SHARP:versus.....

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

16

17 MS. SHARP:jurisdiction.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I was just wondering

20 because I know there was still lots of old fish wheels

21 sitting that hadn't been moved after last year. I

22 thought maybe it didn't go into effect until this year.

23 Thank you. Any other questions for them?

24

25 (No audible response)

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

28

29 MR. NELSON: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman

30 and members of the Council. I'm Dave Nelson. I'm a

31 fishery biologist with the National Park Service

32 stationed in Anchorage and I've been asked to provide a

33 status report to this Council regarding Proposal FP02-22.

34 I realize that there has been reference to Proposal 19,

35 but deferred Proposal 22 and 19 are one and the same.

36 And, since this is a deferred Proposal from last

37 regulatory cycle the Proposal is not in your booklets and

38 no formal action is required of the Council at this time.

39 This is simply for informational purposes.

40

41 This deferred Proposal refers to fish

42 wheel identification in the upper Copper River district,

43 and it was first submitted as Proposal 22 for the 2002

44 regulatory cycle. And, just to put this into

45 perspective, under present regulation a fish wheel must

46 be identified by a sign displaying the fish wheel gear

47 registration number, the name and address of the owner,

48 and the name and address of the operator if other than

49 the owner. And at this time this is identical to present

50 State regulation.

00389

1 As Proposal 22 was originally submitted
2 it requested that a fish wheel be identified only by the
3 registration number of the owner. And as the Proposal
4 worked its way through the 202 regulatory process it was
5 the recommendation of this Council and also of the Staff
6 analysis to identify fish wheels with the owner's
7 registration number, as originally proposed, and the
8 permit number of the operator, if different from the
9 owner.

10
11 This Proposal was deferred by the Federal
12 Subsistence Board in December of 2001. The reason for
13 that is it was necessary to provide for additional time
14 for coordination with the State, and this is because both
15 Federal and State subsistence users operate fish wheels
16 in the upper Copper district, which is the focus of this
17 proposal.

18
19 The goal of coordination was to attempt
20 to develop a regulation that would provide consistency
21 between Federal and State regulations. Coordination
22 meetings have occurred between the State and Federal
23 management Staff, and also between the Federal and State
24 enforcement Staff. However, both the Federal and State
25 enforcement Staff have questioned their ability to
26 enforce the fish wheel identification requirement if only
27 numbers are used. And one of the primary concerns
28 brought out at this preliminary meeting was the
29 methodology to be used to keep the number list current
30 and readily available to both the Federal and State
31 enforcement Staffs.

32
33 Additionally, Mr. Chairman, there is a
34 similar proposal, which is number 29, that will be taken
35 up by the Board of Fisheries in early December. And this
36 proposal also addresses identification of fish wheels by
37 a numbering system. And therefore, at this time it would
38 not be possible for the Federal Staff to accurately
39 present this proposal to this Council without knowing
40 what action the Board of Fisheries will be taking.
41 Therefore, Proposal 22 is not being presented for action
42 to the Council or the Federal Subsistence Board during
43 this fall cycle. However, following action by the Board
44 of Fisheries on State Proposal 29, the Federal Staff will
45 prepare a new analysis. And this analysis will be
46 presented to the Council during it's winter meeting, and
47 following action by the Council it will then be presented
48 to the Federal Subsistence Board during their May meeting
49 for their consideration. And as the Council and Federal
50 Subsistence Board will know the action taken by the Board

00390

1 of Fisheries, this approach will allow opportunity for
2 State and Federal consistency in regards to identifying
3 fish wheels in the upper Copper River district.

4

5 Once again, Mr. Chairman, this is for
6 informational purposes only, no action is required on
7 your part, and this concludes my status report of
8 deferred Proposal number 22.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any
11 questions?

12

13 (No audible response)

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you much.

16

17 MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That was self-
20 explanatory. Okay, Hollis. I don't know if we should
21 let you up there, you usually talk too long.

22

23 MR. TWITCHELL: Gee.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Sorry.

26

27 MR. TWITCHELL: Chair, Council Members,
28 Hollis Twitchell, Denali. It seems like I'm always
29 running right on the edge of the end of a meeting or a
30 lunch hour. So, I will again try to be brief. I only
31 had four things that I thought I would discuss with you
32 and none of them require any action on the part of the
33 Council, I think.

34

35 The first one was the Cantwell three year
36 residency requirement that the Subsistence Resource
37 Commission had advanced. The State has again replied
38 along the same lines saying they didn't feel that the
39 three year residency was necessary, although they did
40 concur that Wrangell-St. Elias has a one year residency
41 proposal and they indicated that they supported that one
42 year proposal. We were waiting for the State's final
43 comments, and now that they've been received we're making
44 a recommendation to the Secretary to respond in the
45 affirmative and suggesting that the three year residency
46 should be proposed in terms of a proposed rule making
47 process. And then comments received through that rule
48 making procedure will be reviewed and at that time a
49 decision as to what sort of residency requirement would
50 be appropriate would be made. And, based on those

00391

1 comments from the public and other advisory groups, the
2 decision somewhere between one and three year residency
3 will probably be advanced.

4

5 The other item I was going to discuss was
6 the Cantwell Harvest Assessment. We were able to receive
7 funding to do harvest assessments in our resident zone
8 communities and Cantwell's draft report I just received
9 about a week ago. So, we just have received that in and
10 once we get our comments in you'll have a final version
11 come out probably before your next meeting, and I'll
12 supply copies to you at that time. Initially the report
13 found that there was very similar, in terms of uses of
14 viable resources by the community as were documented in
15 1984, even though the community has grown some up to 222
16 residents now in Cantwell. The number of pounds and per
17 capita harvests seem to be fairly comparable to what it
18 was in '84.

19

20 One thing that was noticed in this report
21 is that there has been a definite shift in terms of use
22 areas as the result of diminishing wildlife and fisheries
23 populations in Unit 13. And that there's been a shift
24 over to NPS lands as the availability of resources have
25 diminished in neighboring lands due to competition from
26 other resource users and dropping populations and the
27 Park lands are becoming more and more significant to the
28 community. And we see that also in our harvest record
29 information.

30

31 And we also see shifting of users from
32 Cantwell over into the north side, Chistochina area, has
33 continued to increase as the availability of moose has
34 diminished in Unit 13. So, there clearly are some shifts
35 going on in terms of not only resources, but use areas
36 for Cantwell. And I can give you the numbers in terms of
37 harvest if you were so interested in that sort of
38 information for the different types of hunts there.

39

40 The third item I was going to mention is
41 that we are again having proposals advanced by the Alaska
42 Wildlife Alliance to create wolf buffer zones around the
43 north and east flanks of the Park on adjacent State lands
44 and there is a special session by the Board of Game being
45 held in Anchorage next week, the 10th and 11th, to review
46 three proposals in front of the Board. One would be to
47 eliminate the sunset clause for the existing buffer zone
48 of about 98 square miles on the north side of the Park.
49 A second proposal suggests adding another 89 miles to
50 that existing buffer zone. And then a third proposal

00392

1 asked for 147 square miles along the Nenana River on the
2 east flank of the Park. So, those will be addressed next
3 week and the Superintendent will be there to present
4 Agency reports to the Board of Game on those proposals.
5

6 The final item I was going to mention was
7 the Board of Game has also heard for the last two cycles
8 of their meetings proposals to do intensive management
9 for moose in Unit 16B. 16B of course encompasses a
10 portion of Denali National Preserve, our southern
11 preserve, in which we have a Federal registration permit
12 hunt that is going on. 16B area has on the State's
13 behalf been moved to Tier Two hunts only and there was
14 some question as to whether the Federal hunt should
15 continue to have an ample portion of the registration
16 permit hunt. So, we're carefully monitoring what's going
17 on there as well as the SRC. The position of both the
18 Park and the SRC is that we issue so many -- so few
19 permits in the Preserve area averaging anywhere from zero
20 to three in the last eight years, and then we've only had
21 three reported harvests out of that same period of time,
22 that we don't see there's any affect in terms of the
23 Federal program in terms of the population in that area.
24 So, we're reluctant to make any motion or proposal to
25 drop that Federal registration permit hunt at this time,
26 and we are planning to work cooperatively with ADF&G for
27 monitoring and survey work in that area regarding moose
28 populations.
29

30 I guess I actually had a fifth one, but,
31 and I'll mention this just very briefly. We've been
32 petitioned by the Professional Guiding Association and an
33 individual guide to open the North Preserve to guided
34 hunting. Of course, Lake Minchumina our second largest
35 community who do extensive use of both the Preserve and
36 the Park. And the request from the Guiding Association
37 is that we put that as an option in one of the
38 alternatives that are being considered in the back
39 country management plan that the Park is currently under
40 way with. I had a scoping meeting with Minchumina week
41 ago and the community is quite unanimously opposed to any
42 guiding in that north sector. We'll call another SRC
43 meeting shortly to bring this in front of them to get
44 their position on it. Right now it's included as an
45 alternative, not within the NPS preferred alternative,
46 but one of the other alternatives to put that out there
47 for public comment and review.
48

49 That concludes items that I think would
50 have ramifications for subsistence users.

00393

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any questions? Bob.

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, thank you, Hollis,
4 I appreciate your testimony. You said you have figures,
5 preliminary figures on the harvest of game for the
6 Cantwell residents, did I understand that correctly?

7

8 MR. VEACH: Yes, I could. I was going to
9 mention just mainly moose and caribou because those are
10 the larger kinds of species.

11

12 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd be interested.

13

14 MR. VEACH: Otherwise, I can give more
15 general information as well.

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I guess moose and
18 caribou would be my interest. If you could that would be
19 appreciated.

20

21 MR. VEACH: Clearly moose was one of the
22 largest resources utilized in the area according to
23 Alaska Department of Fish and Game statistics for the
24 general hunt, this is the general moose hunt in Unit
25 13(E) area. There were 79 Cantwell residents who
26 participated in that general hunt. They reported 15
27 harvested animals. The results of a Tier II permit hunt
28 in Unit 13(E), ten Cantwell residents received the Tier
29 II permits, only one reported a successful hunt. On the
30 Federal side, which is the Federal Registration Permit
31 Hunt, which is primarily the Denali Park lands and a
32 limited amount of the Tangle Lakes River corridor, the
33 Park Service issued 52 permits, one permit to household
34 to the Cantwell residents, and there were 11 reported
35 harvests of moose from Park lands under that Permit
36 system.

37

38 In terms of caribou, which is a Tier II
39 hunt in Unit 13(E) also, there were 45 Cantwell hunters
40 who received Tier II permits and hunted caribou. There
41 was 11 animals harvested under that program. The Federal
42 Registration Permit system, we issued 124 caribou permits
43 to Cantwell hunters, and there of course, it's two
44 permits per hunter for the Federal program, and from that
45 there has been 14 reported animals harvested. And those,
46 of course, would have to come from Park service lands.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. Kind of a
49 follow up and possibly related, the Alaska Wildlife
50 Alliance is aware of their continued pressure for that

00394

1 buffer zone. Any general thoughts on the biology? Is
2 there any biology whatsoever that supports a buffer zone?

3

4 MR. VEACH: The wolf studies in Denali,
5 which have been going on intensively for the last 15
6 years, but even for a longer period of time, shows that
7 we have what are Department of Interior biologists and
8 resource managers considered to be a natural and healthy
9 population for wolves. That's fairly detailed and a
10 highly scientific study with extensive use of radio
11 telemetry and various other counts. The position that we
12 believe we manage for populations of wildlife, we don't
13 manage for a single pack or an individual animal. But,
14 we view the populations within an ecosystem, that is our
15 management standard. And as such there is no biological
16 reason for the exposure as we see it.

17

18 Harvest levels are very low both outside
19 and inside the Park areas. Combined harvest rates are
20 about five percent of the population, which we consider
21 fairly minimal and easily sustainable by the population.
22 Population will vary between whether its a fall count or
23 a late winter count anywhere from about 80 animals up to
24 about 120. And I don't have the current figures for
25 where it is right now.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: My understanding is as
28 far as the biology is the wolf pack will easily replace
29 fifty percent of itself every year if necessary and with
30 obviously more than sufficient game prey for these wolves
31 five percent is nothing in terms of a biological
32 estimate.

33

34 You also indicated you had a petition I
35 think from APHA to open up hunting opportunities and an
36 individual guide, which guide are we talking about?

37

38 MR. VEACH: I don't have the guide's name
39 right now, but we had a prospectus out for the two
40 existing guides that we have in the Park which operate on
41 the south side in the 16B area, and this individual had
42 applied was not one of those selected, so I think he's
43 looking for further opportunities in the area.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Makes good sense. Thank
46 you. I really appreciate the information.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just one other question.
49 I know moose and caribou make up most of the take of game
50 in the Park. Is there any utilization of sheep at all?

00395

1 MR. VEACH: There are utilization of
2 sheep by Cantwell residents within their community
3 harvest records. Those harvests are occurring outside of
4 Park lands.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

7
8 MR. VEACH: There currently is no
9 subsistence take of sheep in Denali.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Inside the Park or the
12 Preserve?

13
14 MR. VEACH: Although there is an
15 opportunity in the Preserve for taking sheep in 16B, the
16 difficulty in access pretty much has been the filter and
17 we have no reports of subsistence harvest of sheep,
18 although there is a provision within the general State
19 hunting regulations.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, there's a
22 possibility it's just not -- it's just a possibility and
23 that's all. How about, is there much utilization of like
24 ptarmigan or grouse or anything like that in the Park?

25
26 MR. VEACH: There is, although it doesn't
27 rank particularly high. For instance, just looking at
28 some of the preliminary data in terms of Cantwell
29 community wildlife resource harvests, it's 27,599 pounds
30 by usable weight. That's an average household harvest of
31 293 pounds. Moose made up for the largest component of
32 the community's harvest by eligible weight, it was about
33 12,368 pounds. Caribou and sockeye salmon were the next
34 two with caribou coming in at 3,698 pounds and sockeye
35 salmon 3,084 pounds. That was followed by some other
36 species of king salmon, berries, and hare were the next
37 highest rated in terms of pound type species. The other
38 harvest, some of the other small game was there, but very
39 minimal.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Very minimal.

42
43 MR. VEACH: Fisheries overall I believe
44 came in at about 16 percent. Give me just a second here.

45
46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
48 Hollis?

49
50 (No audible response)

00396

1 MR. VEACH: Seventeen percent of the
2 total harvest for fisheries, both salmon and indigenous
3 fish.

4
5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. But moose is the
6 Park's biggest contribution then basically?

7
8 MR. VEACH: Uh-hum. The general sense is
9 that the State is not addressing the community's needs in
10 terms of resources with fairly intense competition from
11 non-local hunters and that the Park Service is an agency
12 that's more responsive to visitor uses and recreational
13 use and it doesn't particularly track and represent the
14 local consumptive user's use. So, they feel sort of
15 impinged between the State and the Federal agencies in
16 terms of their cultural lifestyle and opportunity.

17
18 And that sense is there, although that's
19 changing very clearly in this report. And the same thing
20 that I find where we have quite a number of users
21 recognizing the value of having some lands available
22 where they don't have that intense competition from the
23 rest of the State and non-local users. And, so, that
24 sentiment is expressed in various places throughout this
25 report, and particularly as we see their use shifting to
26 other parts of the Park now.

27
28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Hollis. Do
29 you have anymore, Bob?

30
31 MR. CHURCHILL: Just a comment. I guess
32 to put it in perspective, we're talking about 80 to 120
33 animals, wolves, and the biology I've been given is an
34 adult male wolf can eat easily 20 pounds of meat in a
35 sitting and run and hunt again in under three hours. So,
36 I am looking at the success rate on moose hunting,
37 thinking about the number of animals in the Park, and
38 then trying to put that in perspective of giving even
39 further protection to this number of packs that we're
40 dealing with, and it concerns me from availability of
41 research for subsistence harvesters. So, I think it's
42 instructive. Thank you.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

45
46 MR. VEACH: Thank you.

47
48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll, it's five minutes
49 to twelve, and so I think we're going to take -- I wonder
50 if we can afford an hour and a half break?

00397

1 UNIDENTIFIED: I'm not going anywhere
2 until Saturday.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'm not going anywhere
5 until Saturday either, so the rest of you are stuck.
6 Bill?

7
8 MR. KNAUER: Customary Trade is going to
9 be short.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Customary Trade is going
12 to be short?

13
14 MR. KNAUER: I think so because this
15 Council has already presented it's views.

16
17 MR. CHURCHILL: This is bold talk.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay.

20
21 MR. CHURCHILL: We could do it.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, we're not going to
24 do it before lunch. Let's -- yes?

25
26 UNIDENTIFIED: (indiscernible - no
27 microphone) takes off for lunch, would you mind?

28
29 MR. CHURCHILL: Please.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Please.

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED: I just wanted to let you
34 know, Mr. Joyce shared with you about the district
35 projects along the Copper River Delta and the Copper
36 River itself, that in the east (indiscernible - no
37 microphone) I just wanted to invite you formally for a
38 meeting (indiscernible) host a symposium, it's a two day
39 symposium in November to discuss these projects in more
40 detail as part of our community awareness, what's going
41 on. And that's the 12th and 13th. So, if you get an
42 opportunity to calendar it and the rest come back to
43 Cordova again we welcome you to that. And I'll work with
44 Ann on getting that agenda and announcement out to
45 everybody that's involved.

46
47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, and that's at
48 Cordova, right?

49
50 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, that is. It will be

00398

1 right here.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's recess until 1:30.

4

5 (Off record)

6

7 (On record)

8

9 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
10 members of the Council. My name is Tom Carpenter, I'm a
11 resident of Cordova. I am also the Co-Chair of the local
12 Advisory Committee. I'm testify for myself today though.
13 I'd like to testify on the Customary Trade issues. I
14 think there's a couple of relevant points that I'm sure
15 you've heard before, but I'd like to reiterate just to
16 make sure that you understand some of the feelings that
17 some of us have in town here.

18

19 Understanding that things have changed quite a
20 bit since the discussion on customary trade first came
21 out, and realizing that some of the adjustments in the
22 language that has taken place, and I think some of them
23 are quite credible in regards to the idea that no
24 subsistence fish will be able to enter commerce. That's
25 one of the most significant points that will definitely
26 help the coastal communities where commercial fishing is
27 involved.

28

29 One point though in regards to commerce
30 is that I still have kind of a leery feeling about, is
31 the fact that there are guidelines and limits set, you
32 know, there is already bag limits, but there's going to
33 be a certain dollar value, and there's going to be
34 restrictions between rural people and non-rural people
35 depending on what part of the state you live in.

36

37 But, I guess one of my biggest concerns
38 is I still think that there's a possibility, a great
39 possibility, that when you talk about taking somebody,
40 hypothetically for example, that goes out and takes his
41 legal catch, processes the fish himself, smokes them,
42 hard smokes them, what have you, and he goes out and he
43 sells some of those fish to an individual. Number one
44 those fish haven't been monitored like the commercial
45 processors, the process, the cooking requirements, and
46 things like that. And I think my biggest concern is that
47 the remote possibility, and hopefully it will never
48 happen, that the word botulism will get into the news
49 media, and that word will be related with the word Copper
50 River salmon.

00399

1 I think it would be incredibly
2 unfortunate if the past 25 years of serious marketing and
3 campaigning that the coastal communities have done to
4 raise the bar for Alaska salmon in such an competitive
5 world could possibly be destroyed by something that's
6 non-regulated. I think that's a really big fear in
7 Cordova. It's a really big fear of mine, and I think
8 it's a really big fear among a lot of coastal communities
9 where commercial fishing is the mainstay. You know,
10 hopefully that's just a very remote possibility, but if
11 it were -- I guess the big question to me is, who's going
12 to be liable for the destruction of a coastal community
13 and a commercial fishery that's been so well developed
14 and well so orchestrated over the last 20 years?

15
16 The other point to customary trade that I
17 have a question about is the ability to sell the eggs.
18 And all I can think back is to attending meetings around
19 the state and talking to people from the Yukon-Kuskokwim
20 and trying, you know, they've been obviously trying to
21 figure out why the runs are so decimated now compared to
22 25 years ago. Well, I think personally, that a lot of
23 that had to do with the roe stripping that went on up
24 there. Obviously it was an illegal activity that took
25 place that was not monitored or wasn't enforced. But,
26 I'd hate to think that we'd get to the point to where
27 the, and the eggs are worth so much money today, the
28 black market, you know, there's all kinds of potentials.
29 I'd hate to get to the point where people were starting
30 to do the same thing on the upper Copper in the spawning
31 areas. Obviously there's towns, and villages, and Native
32 organizations, and all kinds of people who are obviously
33 have the same interest that we have down here in the
34 lower river, and obviously they are going to be monitored
35 -- hopefully monitoring the situations in the spawning
36 areas in which we don't have the opportunity to do that.
37 But I think that that's something -- selling of the eggs
38 I think just leaves the possibility open for some serious
39 problems.

40
41 That's basically all I have to say about
42 customary trade, and if you would allow me for just a
43 minute, I have one more comment to make since I have the
44 privilege of having you folks here in town. Last year
45 there was an individual from Cordova that put in a
46 proposal to the Committee, to the RAC to establish a
47 subsistence moose hunt. This proposal was written very
48 diligently. It was taking the different organization's
49 and town's ideas into account. It came before the
50 Advisory Committee and it was a pretty consensual idea

00400

1 when it was sent to the Regional Council, that the way
2 proposal was drafted was the way that we wanted it
3 presented to the Council and the way that we as locals
4 down here wanted the hunt to take place. It went to the
5 Federal Board, it was approved, and everything was fine.
6

7 There are guidelines and there are
8 regulations that are set forth in the paperwork the
9 codified regulations that does not allow the Federal
10 managers to change a hunt in the middle of the season
11 unless it is biological in nature or if there is an
12 emergency that occurs. One of the big things that we did
13 not incorporate into this proposal was the idea of proxy
14 hunting. And by no means do I or any people that were
15 involved in the drafting of that proposal want to
16 withhold or take away from anybody's ability to subsist
17 or to share in part of the moose, that's is not what I'm
18 trying to drive at with my point here.
19

20 My point is that the local Federal Forest
21 Service biologists were asked if proxy hunts could take
22 place for a couple of individuals. Those people went
23 through the books, they talked to Staff in Anchorage, the
24 Staff said no, the Forest Service people said no, and
25 about two weeks later the regulation was changed by a
26 person in the Anchorage office that under his authority
27 and under the regulations that were set forth prior that
28 hunt, he did not have the ability to do that. And my
29 point to the Council is that I don't think that the hard
30 work that you do, and the hard work that the Federal
31 Board does, and the work that the people do in these
32 local communities to try and put forth proposals that
33 represent the ideas of the local communities should
34 necessarily be changed by an individual or a couple
35 individuals in a management position when the regulations
36 in fine print say that they cannot do that. I think
37 that's completely overriding what you do, what we do, and
38 what the Federal Board does. And we kind of take offense
39 to the fact that it happened. And I don't know if you
40 all are aware that that happened, but I just thought that
41 I'd take the opportunity since you were here to enlighten
42 you as to the fact that it did happen.
43

44 So, I appreciate the opportunity to
45 testify before you and if you have any questions I'll
46 sure be glad to answer them. Thanks.
47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, Tom, thanks a
49 million for interrupting your day and coming to talk with
50 us. Could you give me a little more information, a

00401

1 better understanding why you didn't want -- if I'm
2 understanding correctly, you didn't want proxy hunting as
3 part of this hunt?

4

5 MR. CARPENTER: Well, when the individual
6 that came up with the idea, we had pushed it around the
7 Advisory Committee for quite a long time, and you know,
8 you have some people in the towns that are for Federal
9 management, some that are not, and we thought that it was
10 better that some individual put the proposal forward, but
11 he did come before the Committee after he drafted it,
12 consensus from the area biologist, and what have you.

13

14 One of the reasons, the biggest reason
15 that proxy hunting was not included in the Federal
16 proposal was that we feel, and this individual felt, that
17 proxy hunting under State management is one of the most
18 abused things under State practice. And we have no
19 problem with the idea that somebody should be able to go
20 out and harvest a couple deer, or what have you, for an
21 individual, an elder, we have no problem with that. But
22 it's very much abused, it's very much abused statewide,
23 and when you're talking about such a small population of
24 moose and such a small quota that is going to be
25 available for harvest, we felt that it just seemed
26 reasonable if somebody was going to put in for the hunt
27 that they would be able to go out and harvest that
28 animal. There was really no need for a proxy hunt
29 because these moose are really shared throughout the
30 community, you know, from family to family, and there
31 wasn't really a need necessarily for individuals to put
32 in for a hunt if they couldn't go out and harvest it
33 because they'd still have the ability to share in that
34 moose that was taken. So, I guess that was the idea
35 behind it.

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: Tom, thank you. And I
38 guess just to be a little more clear, the abuse you were
39 concerned with in this case would be somebody doing a
40 proxy hunt but the meat would not stay within the
41 community, am I understanding that correctly?

42

43 MR. CARPENTER: That's right.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. Another
46 question that I'd like to develop just a little more for
47 the record, a number of speakers have talked about a
48 health and safety concern regarding harvesting and
49 selling fish outside the normal bounds that are
50 controlled for, under the regulations for safety, for,

00402

1 you know, I guess under good clean conditions. Can you
2 expand on -- my understanding if I remember correctly
3 back in '82 there was an issue with botulism, could you
4 expand on that so it's for the record?

5

6 MR. CARPENTER: Well, back in the '80's
7 there was a pretty serious dent that was put into the
8 pink salmon market when there was a botulism scare, and
9 it really kind of devastated the fishery to the point
10 that it never, in my opinion, has ever been able to
11 regain it's strength that it once had. You put a dent
12 and you put that word out into the media, you know.
13 There's an ever growing population of people that are
14 eating salmon. It's hard enough to compete with the farm
15 fish that are developed and are brought into this country
16 from Chile. And I think that the marketing and the
17 research that's gone into the health standards -- and the
18 one thing that we strive for in Prince William Sound is
19 the ultimate quality that we can provide the consumer in
20 the lower 48, and throughout Alaska, and really the
21 entire world. And it would be just an incredible shame
22 to have a scare get put into the media like was put in in
23 the early '80's with pink salmon because the salmon
24 market in Alaska with the problems it's having now could
25 not withstand another scare like that.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. And, do you
28 consider the Copper River red a niche market, high-end,
29 that might be more susceptible to that type of scare than
30 other salmon markets?

31

32 MR. CARPENTER: Well, that's one of the
33 luxuries that we do have here, is that we're the first
34 wild sockeye on the market every year in the entire
35 world, and for approximately three to five weeks we have
36 an opportunity to receive fairly high prices for our fish
37 because of that. And also because of the quality that
38 the fisherman have shown to prove to the lower 48. And I
39 think that anything at all that would mislead people down
40 south or lead them to believe that the fish that they
41 were getting from the Copper River weren't top quality, I
42 think it would completely be devastating.

43

44 MR. CHURCHILL: So, it's your testimony
45 that you think it would destroy that niche market that
46 exists for Copper River reds?

47

48 MR. CARPENTER: I think it would
49 definitely destroy the reputation that we've built.

50

00403

1 MR. CHURCHILL: And, again, if my memory
2 is correct, there's over 500 permits issued for this
3 fishery and so it would be multiples of that that would
4 be directly affected.

5
6 MR. CARPENTER: There's approximately 500
7 to 525 permits on the Copper River and Prince William
8 Sound. And I would say that out of community of 2,000
9 people that of those 500 permits there's probably 75
10 percent of the community, if not more, that would be
11 affected by the weakening of the niche markets.

12
13 MR. CHURCHILL: And may well have a
14 ripple affect on other wild salmon markets here in
15 Alaska.

16
17 MR. CARPENTER: It very well could,
18 because I think the way the media portrays things is
19 that, you know, it might say Copper River sockeye, but I
20 think Cook Inlet, and Southeast Alaska, and Kodiak, and
21 Bristol Bay, especially with the amount of fish that they
22 put on the market, it would be a trickling effect.

23
24 MR. CHURCHILL: Tom, thanks a million.

25
26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

27
28 MR. CARPENTER: Thanks very much.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Just one clarification.
31 In talking to you and talking to others, the objection to
32 what happened isn't basically against the individuals
33 that took part in it as much as it is that proper
34 procedure wasn't followed and nobody else had the chance
35 to put input into it.

36
37 MR. CARPENTER: That's right. There's
38 absolutely, there's no resentment at all in town
39 whatsoever to the two individuals. They were elderly
40 people that -- there was no resentment at all the fact
41 that they were trying to make their opportunities, you
42 know, whole. The main point that I was trying to make is
43 that we don't feel that an individual or individuals in a
44 management position with a set of guidelines before them,
45 that completely override what the guidelines were set
46 forth, should have the ability to undo what the Regional
47 Council and the Federal Subsistence Board and the
48 proposers of the proposal had in the intent for. So,
49 there's in no means or any way do we want to deny
50 opportunity. That is not what it's about. It's about

00404

1 the idea that the hard work that was put into it was
2 overturned for no apparent legal reason.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I understand what you
5 meant because I was approached on it. I didn't realize
6 there was anything against proxy. I called to find out
7 if special action could be taken. I was told special
8 action couldn't be taken. It took me totally by surprise
9 when all of the sudden I found out special action had
10 been taken.

11

12 MR. CARPENTER: Well, one of the other
13 unfortunate things, is that the local biologist here, the
14 Federal managers for these hunts, they do a really good
15 job down here in trying to accommodate people as much as
16 they can. And I think it gave both of them a black eye
17 for no apparent reason whey they were told that they did
18 not have the ability to accommodate these two individuals
19 because of regulation, and that if those individuals or
20 anybody for that matter had an idea that they wanted to
21 change that they had the ability to come before the
22 Regional Council with a proposal the next year to
23 overturn that regulation that did allow proxy hunting.
24 So, we are definitely not trying to restrict opportunity.
25 The more moose that gets spread around these local
26 communities the better. It's just the idea and the
27 practice behind what happened.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You wouldn't have had an
30 objection to a proposal coming before the Council or
31 coming before the Board because that would have been the
32 proper avenue and you would have had a chance to speak to
33 it and this community would have had a chance to speak to
34 it?

35

36 MR. CARPENTER: That's right. Anybody
37 has the ability to bring a proposal before any group, has
38 the ability to bring something that they feel should be
39 changed, and it gives the public the opportunity to bring
40 before you as I am now, their feelings and their concerns
41 about if that should or should not take place. And
42 that's what your job is, is to make those decisions, to
43 hear the full story. But, that's not what took place
44 here.

45

46 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
47 questions for Tom?

48

49 (No audible response).

50

00405

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you, Tom.

2

3 MR. CARPENTER: Thanks a lot.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: With that, Janet Cohen,
6 the last of our number 14. No it isn't. Number 14.3.

7

8 MS. COHEN: Thank you. Good afternoon

9 Mr. Chairman and Regional Advisory Council members. For
10 the record, my name is Janet Cohen. I'm an

11 anthropologist with the National Park Service Regional
12 Office in Anchorage. I am before you today as a Federal

13 member of the Subsistence Use Amounts Protocol Work
14 Group. In front of you, not part of your Board book, you

15 should have a small packet of information that starts
16 with a cover memorandum from this Work Group, and there

17 are extras on the table for audience members that would
18 like to look at the information.

19

20 Your packet includes general information

21 on the protocol, our revised charge, the work group

22 members, a timeline, and an appendix, which is the State

23 Board of Fisheries amounts necessary for subsistence use

24 determinations. I'll wait and show you what it looks

25 like if you need.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have to look through
28 this stack of papers.

29

30 MS. COHEN: It's a memo dated August

31 30th, the cover sheet of it.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think it's at the

34 bottom of my stack.

35

36 MS. COHEN: I think Ann gave it to you

37 that first day, so maybe it would be back at the bottom.

38

39 UNIDENTIFIED: We'll share.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We'll share.

42

43 MS. COHEN: Okay.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe I took it home to

46 read it.

47

48 UNIDENTIFIED: Or it's under here?

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's not under here

00406

1 UNIDENTIFIED: Did you find yours?

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I didn't find mine,
4 but she found her's. You probably got Fred's and mine.

5

6 MS. COHEN: Are we good to go? It's
7 okay. It's a lot of paperwork we are all dealing with.

8

9 I would like to outline a little of the
10 history of this protocol, give you an update to the
11 Working Group's progress, and most importantly, get your
12 input. A State Federal Memorandum of Agreement was
13 signed a little over two years ago and continues to be
14 implemented to facilitate coordinated fisheries
15 management. The MOA outlines a number of protocols that
16 would be worked on, and one of these is the Subsistence
17 Use Amounts Protocol. This protocol represents an effort
18 to make sure that State and Federal managers are looking
19 at the same levels of allocation for subsistence
20 fisheries. It's just one tool to help provide some
21 security for a subsistence allocation. The protocol
22 we're suggesting would initially focus on just the Yukon
23 River following guidance provided by the Regional Council
24 Chairs last December. In other words, we'd like to try
25 this on for size in just one area, a pilot project of
26 sorts.

27

28 First, let me just quickly review the
29 charge for you and for the audience's sake so that
30 everyone can keep that in mind throughout the discussion.
31 And the charge as revised at our meeting in August of
32 this year reads: the Subsistence Use Amounts Work Group
33 consists of State and Federal agency and Federal Regional
34 Subsistence Advisory Council representatives and is
35 charged with designing a protocol for establishing
36 subsistence use amounts in the Federal subsistence
37 regulations that will compliment the exiting amounts
38 necessary for subsistence uses of fish and wildlife found
39 in State regulations and in making new subsistence use
40 amounts for areas and species where none currently exist.
41 The protocol will provide a process for continuing
42 subsistence uses of fish and wildlife resources, while
43 allowing for other beneficial uses on Federal public
44 lands when harvestable surpluses are sufficient
45 consistent with provisions both in ANILCA and Alaska
46 Statute. The Group will initially focus on developing
47 Federal Subsistence use amounts for the Yukon River
48 salmon and use this as a model for creating a process to
49 make future Federal subsistence use amount findings for
50 other fish and wildlife species as recommended by the

00407

1 Regional Council chairs. The group will also consider
2 how these Federal subsistence use amounts findings will
3 be implemented across jurisdictional boundaries.

4

5 By the way of review, the Federal use of
6 the terminology subsistence use amounts is the same the
7 State's use of amounts necessary for subsistence. Please
8 remember two very important points, subsistence use
9 amounts are not a numerical fishing cap and also, these
10 numbers can be revised. Subsistence use amounts are
11 expressed as a range. For example, in the Yukon River the
12 range for fall chum is expressed as 89,500 to 167,100
13 fish. The range in this case comes from about 10 years
14 worth of harvest data and that low end number, the 89,500
15 actually doesn't represent the lowest harvest, it
16 represents a more average year harvest, while the highest
17 end does represent the highest harvest. I believe, and
18 someone from the State can correct me, that that's how
19 those numbers were developed. Again, these numbers can
20 be revised, and there are several examples in the State
21 system where communities have come forward and the
22 amounts necessary for subsistence have been revised.

23

24 And two other things I'd like to explain
25 that a lot of people ask about, and by way of review, are
26 how these numbers apply to management sort of on the
27 ground. Typically, the State Board of Fish would look at
28 run status and subsistence harvests and ask if there were
29 enough fish to provide for subsistence. Assuming the
30 answer was yes, they could go on to ask if there was
31 enough additional fish to provide for other uses.

32

33 For now the way it could be used in the
34 Federal system is slightly different. In some cases the
35 Federal Board has been asked to completely close Federal
36 waters to non-subsistence uses and we've gotten into
37 disagreements with the State as to whether such an action
38 is necessary or not. The State can identify an amount
39 necessary for subsistence and say that they think the run
40 will allow for that harvest. The Federal Board, however,
41 does not currently have a subsistence use amount and so
42 the State has made claims that some of these Federal
43 decisions are not being made systematically.

44

45 So, that explanation leads us into where
46 we're at now as a protocol work group, where we're
47 headed, and what we'd like you input on specifically,
48 that is this revised charge, including the intent of
49 where the work group would like to go, particularly for
50 initially developing a protocol just to apply to the

00408

1 Yukon River, and then also our timeline.

2

3 During discussions about establishing
4 Federal subsistence use amounts for the Yukon, the work
5 group has talked about adopting the ranges established by
6 the State with the understanding that these ranges can be
7 revised if and when new information becomes available.

8

9 Regarding the timeline, and you can see
10 that in your packet, I do want to emphasize that we are
11 intentionally taking a very slow approach to this
12 protocol. If you'll look at the page that's your
13 timeline you'll note that right now we're about half way
14 down that page, September to October 2002 Regional
15 Advisory Council review of protocol change.

16

17 The actual implementation, if you
18 continue on, would not occur until June of 2004, a year
19 from next June.

20

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's my
22 presentation.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Mr.
25 Churchill.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you very much,
28 Janet, I appreciate it. Some questions I have is, are
29 these amounts purely aimed at human consumption or do
30 they include all uses?

31

32 MS. COHEN: That's a good question and
33 I'm not sure I can answer that.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: What was that question?

36

37 MR. CHURCHILL: The question is when we
38 talk about these amounts. Fish are taken both for human
39 consumption and other uses, and I'm just wondering if
40 these numbers embrace both.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You mean like for dog
43 food?

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Exactly.

46

47 MS. COHEN: And actually I believe that
48 as they've been established thus far, they just represent
49 the harvest. So, they haven't been divided into an
50 expression of human consumption versus sled dogs. But

00409

1 that would be an important point for the work group to
2 consider as new species and numbers were established.

3

4 MR. CHURCHILL: So, your best guess, and
5 again I understand it's a guesstimate it's for all
6 uses?

7

8 MR. COHEN: Correct.

9

10 MR. CHURCHILL: Is that -- also when they
11 talk about harvest does it exclude harvesting for
12 commercial use, where there are often fish that are
13 caught for sale, and I don't mean under barter and trade,
14 but I mean harvested for sale. And I know at least in
15 the testimony I've taken, sometimes these are intermixed
16 where you have a commercial operation and those are added
17 into the numbers harvested.

18

19 MS. COHEN: I know they are mixed at
20 times. I believe these numbers represent information
21 gathered from the Subsistence Household Harvest Surveys
22 and from subsistence calendars and they represent a pure
23 subsistence harvest.

24

25 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you. I appreciate
26 it.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS: I'm a little concerned
31 about this concept of putting amounts on subsistence.
32 The thing that comes to my mind is subsistence fishing is
33 supposed to be the first and highest priority. And I
34 know they've had to close subsistence fishing on the
35 Yukon, but that's far different than the Copper River,
36 Prince William, and Cook Inlet areas. It seems to me
37 that if we're going to have real consistent fishing
38 available for the people there should be no closures on
39 the fishing. If the fish are depleted down to where
40 there's no fish their not going to catch nothing anyway.
41 I don't want to fish when there's no fish. I want to
42 fish when there's lots of fish. And I haven't found a
43 fish yet that read the tide book or the regulations.
44 And, you know, it just seems to me that fishing is just
45 that, fishing. And when I see amounts put on something,
46 right now we have a State subsistence fishery in Seldovia
47 for king salmon, and it's 200 kings, but the real
48 question is, who's counting?

49

50 And we've got this past year I see we had

00410

1 20 permits. The limited area we have is so small that
2 putting an amount doesn't make an awful lot of sense to
3 me. People that are working, they have jobs, and so
4 forth, during the summer months, they don't have the
5 opportunity to fish during some of these times and
6 amounts and so forth. They've got to fish when they get
7 home and get a chance to fish. Right now we have a crab
8 personal use fishery in the middle of the summer when
9 everybody is busy. But the tourists enjoy it because
10 they're the ones that access our crab. And I just have a
11 bad feeling about trying to set amounts because the State
12 wants to set amounts. I don't think the Federal system
13 should set amounts and unfortunately, we don't have
14 Federal lands in Seldovia so we're stuck with the State
15 system, but it's not a good system. Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, I'm going to be the
18 Devil's advocate and take the other side because I'm
19 dealing with the Copper River. And I'm looking at what
20 we have right down here on the Copper River and
21 remembering that the Copper River is a complex river with
22 a commercial fishery at the mouth of it. Our Copper
23 River management program, which I see the numbers have
24 been taken right out of for all practical purposes, is
25 set up in such a way as to assure that there will be at
26 least that many fish up there for the subsistence user,
27 but we also have to assure that there is fish up there
28 for the sport user, we have to assure there is fish up
29 there for the escapement for the biological concept and
30 that's first.

31

32 So, this year we put 819,000 fish through
33 the counter so that there would be sufficient fish to
34 meet all of these needs. We have a number here for the
35 subsistence fishery, it's the only one that really has a
36 number other than escapement because biological
37 escapement comes first. The only time the subsistence
38 fishery would be closed down was if there was
39 insufficient for biological escapement. And, I'll
40 disagree with you on that Fred. If there's not
41 sufficient for biological escapement, this has been
42 proven all over the world, that people will take the last
43 salmon for food as long as it's there if there's nothing
44 to stop them. It doesn't matter how hard it is to get.
45 If you take a look at the history of salmon all over the
46 world, and remember that salmon used to exist all over
47 Europe and lots of Asia, and the rest of the places.
48 Japan had salmon runs all over. And if you've got a
49 population of people and you've got no restrictions on it
50 it doesn't matter if it's the last salmon in the creek,

00411

1 somebody will take it. Now, maybe you won't take it, and
2 maybe somebody that thinks won't take it, but somebody
3 will take it. And this has happened with Atlantic salmon
4 all over the world. So, what you have to do is you have
5 to provide for that biological escapement first. And if
6 that means, if there's insufficient for biological
7 escapement that means that you close the subsistence
8 fishery so that you have a fishery in the future.
9

10 Now, before you close the subsistence
11 fishery by law, you close all of the other fisheries.
12 And, in our case, the way we operate on the Copper River,
13 if there's insufficient fish going through the counter
14 the commercial fishery is closed until there is
15 sufficient fish to provide for biological escapement to
16 meet these subsistence needs that we've got quantified
17 right here and then to allow a percentage of it for the
18 sport fishermen and for the commercial fishermen. And I
19 think they're necessary. I think they're totally
20 necessary.
21

22 You have to understand what somebody
23 needs so that you can work it into your plan to plan to
24 get that many fish up there for them. If you don't know
25 what they need, you're going to either short somebody or
26 you're going to have waste of fish. And in this case,
27 what we have right here, I look at the numbers right here
28 and it's got upper Copper River district 60 to 75,000.
29 And if my memory serves me right, it's been between 60 and
30 85,000 that have been taken there over the past 20 years
31 practically. That's the number -- by the users being
32 open all of the time that's how much they take. And then
33 it has become the number that's needed in the plan to
34 provide for them after providing for biological
35 escapement. And I think some of these numbers, like when
36 I look at lingcod, and rock fish, and ground fish, I feel
37 like they're just numbers that somebody grabbed out of a
38 hat and they really don't mean anything. But if you have
39 a complex river system -- now if you've got a small
40 stream and the only fishery that's on it is is a
41 subsistence fishery that's a totally different case than
42 if you've got a complex, like the Yukon-Kuskokwim, or the
43 Copper, or one of those rivers that you've got
44 commercial, sport, and subsistence fishery, you have to
45 provide for biological escapement first, subsistence
46 second, and after that the sport and commercial fishery,
47 but you've got to know what's needed. First for the
48 biological escapement and then second for the subsistence
49 escapement so that you could say, we have an excess for
50 the sport fishermen or we have an excess for the

00412

1 commercial fishermen.

2

3 If you don't know what's needed somebody
4 could say -- I mean, what would happen if let's say
5 they've taken 60 to 85,000 fish in the upper Copper for
6 subsistence, and all of the sudden you want a quarter
7 million put into the program for subsistence. They're
8 never taken, but we want a quarter of a million fish
9 right there. Some other group would have to give up
10 200,000 fish that would go up there, and at this point in
11 time probably not be taken. So you have to have a range.
12 So, I'll disagree with you on that.

13

14 MR. ELVSAAS: No, I've got to say that
15 we've got two different types of subsistence fisheries
16 here. You're in river.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

19

20 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, if I had my way
21 there would never be in river fishing, that's spawning
22 grounds.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Careful.

25

26 MR. ELVSAAS: When the fish gets past the
27 markers, you know, that's a whole different thing. We're
28 fishing out in the ocean, and, you know, we have a very
29 limited small area to put single nets along the beach.
30 Thousands of fish are swimming right outside of us, we
31 can't access them, so it's a totally different fishery
32 and methods.

33

34 MS. COHEN: And your fishery that you're
35 talking about is really the personal use fishery, not the
36 subsistence?

37

38 MR. ELVSAAS: No, it's subsistence, State
39 subsistence. We also have personal use fisheries in the
40 same areas later.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hate to say it, Fred,
43 but, you know, there's other people that say, oh, that's
44 an intercept fishery, the only way to handle salmon is in
45 the terminal fisheries.

46

47 MR. ELVSAAS: No, it's subsistence.
48 State subsistence. We also have personal use fisheries
49 in the same areas later.

50

00413

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I hate to say it, Fred,
2 but there's other people that say, oh, that's an
3 intercept fishery. The only way to handle salmon is in
4 the terminal fishery. So I mean that's just a different
5 viewpoint, a different way of looking at it. Oh, of
6 course, as far as I'm concerning, fish aren't even edible
7 after they hit freshwater, you know. Mr. Churchill.

8
9 MR. CHURCHILL: Maybe I can dig us out of
10 this one by asking a different question. When you
11 establish your range, and I've been involved in some of
12 these project, generally the high end of the range, from
13 my limited experience, comes at times of shortages of
14 other subsistence resources. That might be helpful when
15 you're gathering information. Well, I mean it was true
16 when I was raised. If all we had was deer to harvest
17 that year, we ate a lot of deer. When we had a lot of
18 alternatives, we exercised those. So if those could be
19 folded in and when you have these spikes on usage so the
20 result isn't unnecessarily restricting other users, it
21 might be helpful to the project.

22
23 MS. COHEN: Thank you. Yes, that has
24 been discussed and that is, I believe, one of the items
25 listed under issues perhaps. Accounting for variations
26 in local and regional needs for particular fish or
27 wildlife resources in a given year that can result from
28 the scarcity of other resources used for subsistence
29 purposes.

30
31 MR. CHURCHILL: Janet, thank you.

32
33 MS. WELLS: Where do you account for the
34 personal use fish? We're talking subsistence fish here,
35 but there's also personal use fisheries where people who
36 are in "urban" areas must take advantage of those for our
37 subsistence fish. Are those numbers incorporated at all
38 in these?

39
40 MS. COHEN: Not in these. In the Federal
41 program, of course, we deal specifically with the
42 subsistence fishery, so that would be an issue that
43 perhaps the State folks separately deal with.

44
45 MS. WELLS: But your working with the
46 State folks to get numbers on salmon, for example.
47 Shouldn't those be considered as well?

48
49 MS. COHEN: I see what you're saying. I
50 believe these are strictly numbers that the State's

00414

1 established from historic subsistence records, but that
2 is a different category. You're right, there are people
3 that take from those fisheries feeling it's subsistence
4 but it's been labeled personal use. I don't know how the
5 system will accommodate that, frankly.

6

7 MS. WELLS: Well, when they come up the
8 inlet in Cook Inlet, they aren't labeled.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I can give you an idea.
11 If you just turn to this Prince William Sound Copper
12 River District area, you'll see what happens with the
13 numbers, knowing how the Copper River Management Plan was
14 prior. We have a Prince William Sound Glennallen
15 District of the Upper Copper River District salmon
16 60-75,000. That used to be subsistence. Then we had a
17 Prince William Sound Chitina subdistrict of the Upper
18 Copper River District. Up until the Board made a
19 decision -- two springs ago or last spring?

20

21 MR. TAUBE: 1999.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 1999. This number
24 wouldn't have been in here. This number was a personal
25 use number.

26

27 MR. TAUBE: It was 100,000.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 100,000 as a personal
30 use number and this is a variation of that number, a
31 range. But up until that time this number wouldn't have
32 been on this chart, but now the State has said that's a
33 subsistence fishery, so it's a State and a Federal
34 subsistence fishery, so that number has converted over to
35 a subsistence number.

36

37 MS. WELLS: So those numbers though --
38 I'm looking at Cook Inlet and I'm just seeing link cod
39 and rockfish for our area and somehow into these numbers
40 should be factored in those Kasilof personal use fishery,
41 Seldovia, so that we have an idea of the needs for
42 personal consumption. We do have the definitions of
43 personal use and subsistence, the variation in the
44 subsistence having the customary trade issue that we're
45 going to have to take up, but we do need to know how many
46 fish do individuals need to consume outside of purchasing
47 commercially. That needs to be taken into consideration
48 so that that personal use fishery wouldn't be shorted.

49

50 MS. COHEN: You're right. My

00415

1 understanding is that first we'll try the Yukon where we
2 have some good, solid numbers and as new amounts are
3 established for these other areas, other fisheries, there
4 will be a lot of opportunity for public and agency input,
5 so we'll be able to take care of that concern.

6

7 MS. WELLS: My concern was that in
8 working very closely with the State that those are
9 considerations, too.

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other comments on
12 this protocol that's in front of us? I told Bill that we
13 would go next with him. Wait a second, we haven't
14 finished all of 14, have we? Go ahead, Bill. Let's take
15 care of the controversial one. Then we'll take a break
16 and we'll have the easy ones.

17

18 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
19 For the record, my name is Bill Knauer. Actually, it's
20 the same name I use off the record, too.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are you sure?

23

24 MR. KNAUER: I've been called a lot of
25 things. I think you've probably all received, maybe have
26 in front of you this document called customary trade
27 supplemental materials. I'll be referring to it
28 occasionally during this presentation. In response to
29 both public and Regional Council request, the Federal
30 Subsistence Board, during their meeting in May of this
31 year, deferred action on the proposed rule for customary
32 trade until January of '03. Their decision reflects the
33 concerns of entities around the state that there was
34 inadequate time and opportunity for organizations to do a
35 thorough analysis and provide their comments. Since May,
36 the Board has been analyzing the public council and
37 agency comments they have received to date and they're
38 provided in summary in this booklet and also in a
39 supplemental document for your analysis.

40

41 I'd like for those that may not be as
42 familiar with this, both either on the Council or in the
43 audience, to review a couple of things. Why the issue of
44 customary trade is before you. Title VIII of ANILCA
45 specifically identifies customary trade as a recognized
46 part of subsistence uses. The term customary trade is
47 defined in our regulations as the cash sale of fish and
48 wildlife resources to support personal or family needs
49 and does not constitute a trade which would be a
50 significant commercial enterprise.

00416

1 It's important to distinguish between the
2 terms customary trade and barter, which are frequently
3 used interchangeably. In our regulations, customary
4 trade is the exchange of subsistence resources for cash.
5 Barter is defined as the exchange of subsistence
6 resources for something other than cash and is also
7 provided for in Title VIII.

8
9 This proposed rule actually only covers
10 the customary trade aspect of that. Over the years, the
11 Board has found that the term significant commercial
12 enterprise is unclear. The Board does wish to preserve
13 the traditional customary trade practices and recognize
14 regional differences while preventing any abuse that
15 could occur. The lack of definition is also hampering
16 effective law enforcement practices to prevent such
17 abuses from occurring.

18
19 The Board adopted in December of '01 a
20 proposed rule which recommends that no dollar limit be
21 set on the exchange for cash of subsistence-caught fish,
22 parts or eggs between rural residents. The proposed
23 rule, as it was published, would also prohibit the
24 exchange to fisheries businesses. However, the exchange
25 for cash between rural residents and others would
26 continue to be allowed as long as the exchange does not
27 make up a significant commercial enterprise. You'll
28 notice that that term is still in the proposed rule,
29 which was placed out there to provide the opportunity for
30 comment and Council recommendations.

31
32 Public comments received as a result of
33 the publication of the proposed rule-making generally
34 fell into three categories or alternatives. The bulk of
35 these comments supported either alternative one or two,
36 with alternative three being the recommendations of the
37 Regional Councils that were developed during their
38 meetings that were held last winter.

39
40 Alternative one, which is on page three
41 of that document, is essentially the proposed rule as it
42 was published, assuming that in the future any perceived
43 abuses would be addressed on a case-by-case basis with
44 appropriate new regulatory language. The regulations for
45 customary trade do appear in what we call Subpart D and
46 are subject to annual review and proposals.

47
48 Alternative two, which is on page four,
49 would prohibit subsistence-caught fish from entering the
50 commercial market at any time while continuing customary

00417

1 trade practices to continue. A number of Regional
2 Councils expressed concern and I've heard some concern
3 here today that individuals or organizations would like
4 to see that aspect brought forward in the final
5 regulations.

6

7 Alternative three, which starts on page
8 four also, would implement paragraphs 11 and 12 on a
9 regional basis. A number of the Regional Councils have
10 indicated that they would see differences from other
11 regions and would like to see those implemented. For
12 example, this region had indicated that in paragraph 12
13 they would like to see that customary trade would be
14 restricted between rural residents and others to personal
15 or family consumption only and that there would be record
16 keeping and that the amount would be limited to not
17 exceed \$1,000. That was both the recommendation of this
18 Council for the Cook Inlet area and the Prince William
19 Sound area.

20

21 Right now we're going through a time
22 schedule that is working towards a final rule. The
23 Council meetings this month and last month are focusing
24 on this. At the same time, we're going through a period
25 of intense consultation with the tribes
26 around the state. There is an additional opportunity for
27 general public comment, which will end the first of
28 November, and then there will be a Federal Subsistence
29 Board meeting in January, starting January 14th, to
30 examine all the public comments and determine what
31 should be the final rule. We anticipate the publication
32 of that rule in probably late February with the rule
33 effective about April 1st.

34

35 So, in summary, what the Board is
36 requesting of the Councils is to review their earlier
37 recommendation, if they made one, and either reconfirm or
38 modify, if they so desire, that recommendation. That
39 recommendation, essentially, if they put a dollar amount,
40 is saying, okay, we consider that over, in your case,
41 \$1,000 constitutes a significant commercial enterprise,
42 so you're putting a \$1,000 limit on it.

43

44 The Board would also like your opinion on
45 whether or not there should be any limit on the exchange
46 for cash between rural residents. Previously, you'd
47 indicated that you do not feel that was necessary to
48 place a limit on it.

49

50 The last question is, do you believe

00418

1 these recommendations would have any adverse effect
2 either on the resource or on the subsistence users? So,
3 with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll stop and entertain any
4 questions.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan, did you have a
7 question?

8

9 MS. WELLS: Yes. On 12, where it talks
10 about transactions between rural residents and others,
11 I'd like to know who is eligible in this paragraph where
12 it says customary trade for fish, their parts or their
13 eggs legally taken under the regulation in this part from
14 a rural resident to a commercial entity other than
15 fishery business. So who are we talking about or not
16 talking about?

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: Susan, which 12?

19

20 MS. WELLS: I'm on page one. I'm just
21 reading as it's written on that first page there, on page
22 one. I didn't go into any of the different changes in
23 there. I'm just trying to get an idea of who we're
24 talking about as a commercial entity.

25

26 MR. KNAUER: That might be a local
27 village store, it might be a restaurant, something like
28 that. This is one arena where some of the regions have
29 indicated that they do not feel subsistence-harvested
30 fish should enter commerce at any point, so they wish
31 that portion struck. For this Council, the
32 recommendation was to word it a little bit differently,
33 saying used for personal and family consumption of the
34 individual who purchases the fish, so that approaches it
35 in a little similar manner but with a little bit
36 different wording.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: This comes from up north
39 where a lot of whitefish and things like that are traded
40 through the local store and, consequently, like whitefish
41 will be brought to the local -- I'll use AC, but I'm not
42 sure if it's an AC, the local store, which is not
43 required to have a fisheries business license, at least
44 we don't think it is, and the guy will take whitefish to
45 the store, trade it for the groceries or sell it to the
46 store for his groceries and then they sell it to the rest
47 of the village because only one guy goes out and catches
48 them. That's where the idea behind this one came. In
49 our area, we thought that the fish that are sold to
50 others, the others should be buying it not for resale but

00419

1 for their own personal consumption. In other words, we
2 didn't see the need to have it sold to the local grocery
3 store and then resold. But there was a lot of concern
4 about this up north.

5
6 MS. WELLS: And even when we're looking
7 at this area, who those commercial entities might be.

8
9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: They would have to be
10 commercial entities that aren't required by state law to
11 have a license to receive fish. Technically speaking, if
12 a grocery store has a butcher shop and buys raw fish from
13 a fisherman and processes that raw fish and sells it,
14 they're required to have this license.

15
16 MS. WELLS: And what about a restaurant
17 then?

18
19 MR. KNAUER: I don't believe a restaurant
20 is required to have a license under Alaska Statute
21 43.75.011.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't think so either.

24
25 MS. WELLS: So they could possibly buy
26 some fish and clean it and prepare it right in their own
27 kitchen?

28
29 MR. KNAUER: Sell it to their customers.

30
31 MS. WELLS: What about a lodge?

32
33 MR. KNAUER: That would be another good
34 example. Those are examples of commercial entities that
35 are not licensed fishery businesses.

36
37 MS. WELLS: I think that verbiage would
38 sure cut out some of the abuses that could happen.

39
40 MR. ELVSAAS: I have one question. Is it
41 necessary that the same regulation be statewide?

42
43 MR. KNAUER: That's one of the things
44 that the Board is very interested in. You'll notice
45 that's one of the alternatives. Alternative three is to
46 use a regulation that is tailored to each region and
47 based on individual regional differences. For example,
48 in the Bristol Bay area, they felt the dollar amount
49 should be a limit of \$500 as opposed to \$1,000. I have
50 heard some recommendations that it not be a dollar

00420

1 amount, which is entirely dependant upon the market, but
2 should be a poundage amount or a number of fish, which is
3 less cyclic.

4

5 MS. WELLS: How about a percentage?

6

7 MR. ELVSAAS: I have heartburn over the
8 dollar amount, too. I think it should be a percentage of
9 the catch. I think that 30 percent is more than
10 sufficient to offset. It was my understanding in Region
11 2 that the concept of sales was to offset the costs of
12 nets and gas and motors and so forth to catch subsistence
13 fish, not to be in the business of competing with the
14 commercial fisheries. I think in wrangling over the word
15 significant, if you struck the word significant in Region
16 2 and the purchaser of the fish must purchase for their
17 own use so they could not resell, I think that would fit
18 much better for our area, but it wouldn't work up north
19 like Ralph was talking about because they need to do
20 those sales to exist. That's part of their subsistence
21 lifestyle.

22

23 MR. KNAUER: You can get a better idea of
24 what the Council recommended with the strike-outs and
25 additions on page 13.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We cannot strike the
28 word significant.

29

30 MR. ELVSAAS: We can't?

31

32 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can't. Because, see,
33 that's what we're dealing with. Title VIII of the Alaska
34 National Interest Lands Conservation Act. That is the
35 language in that act. What we're trying to do is we're
36 trying to come up with a definition or a way to say what
37 we feel significant is. That word is there. That's the
38 word we're dealing with. Ann.

39

40 MS. WILKINSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
41 I believe that that word significant comes in regulation
42 and not in ANILCA. I'm not sure, but I don't think it
43 is.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You're right. It's
46 regulation, not part of the Act.

47

48 MR. KNAUER: That's correct. And the
49 terminology was derived from legislative history and
50 discussions during the development of Title VIII. You're

00421

1 also correct that by putting either a dollar amount or a
2 poundage amount or percentage amount you are trying to
3 help the Board define what your Council believes to be
4 the upper limit before it becomes a significant
5 commercial enterprise.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, I notice when I go
8 back here to where we have our option three where every
9 area has a different one and I look at what we have down
10 for Cook Inlet and Prince William Sound, first of all, I
11 notice that our 50 percent got into a lot of other
12 people's proposal, so it must have struck a cord some
13 place. I also noticed that the record keeping that
14 Bristol Bay suggested got into our proposal and I know we
15 went along with that, but one of the things that we said
16 isn't in ours right here. I don't know if it's because
17 we didn't vote on it or if we said it later or what, but
18 where we were talking about on Section 11 and Section 12
19 where we said customary trade for fish, their parts,
20 legally taken under the regulations to individuals other
21 than rural residents is permitted as long as it is used
22 for personal and family consumption of the individual who
23 purchases the fish, didn't get in our alternative.
24 That's how we addressed the idea that it wouldn't go into
25 even the commercial markets, like restaurants and stores.

26

27

28 On page 6, 7, Cook Inlet fisher
29 management, and where I was looking at was page 13,
30 Southcentral Region Advisory Council recommended adopting
31 Sections 11 and 13 and Section 12, changing it that way.

32

33 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman, you're
34 absolutely correct. It appears that that was a
35 typographical oversight.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. So that was an
38 oversight. It wasn't that we didn't want that in, it
39 just didn't get in there. We talked about that as a way
40 of addressing exactly what Susan is talking about to keep
41 it from entering -- because in our area entering
42 restaurants is big business.

43

44 MR. CHURCHILL: That's my memory, too,
45 and I thought the language was carefully drafted with the
46 intent to avoid any type of commercial. By putting it in
47 the positive, that would be a very positive way to do it
48 and it seems to slam the door rather tightly. I thought
49 that was great language.

50

00422

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I know one of the
2 biggest concerns in our area and even from the other
3 people that I talked to is a lot of people have family
4 and friend that live in the urban area and they'd like to
5 bring them and sell them fish strips and stuff like that,
6 but those people are going to be consuming them, not
7 reselling them. With the tourist industry and the
8 restaurant industry and everything we have in
9 Southcentral, the last thing we want is it to go in the
10 open market in any way. Susan.

11
12 MS. WELLS: Well, one of the elders I was
13 talking to at home, in her view, when she kippers fish
14 and cans it and then gets about \$100 a case, she looks at
15 it as selling her work, not the fish. It takes a
16 tremendous amount of time to clean the fish and cut it
17 and hang it and strip it and smoke it and can it. Her
18 interpretation is selling her time and she's definitely
19 not for selling the fish. She doesn't even have a price
20 tag on it. It's more of a gratuity when she gives her
21 fish to people who can't access it and can't smoke or
22 kipper it as well as she can.

23
24 MR. CHURCHILL: So processing fee.

25
26 MS. WELLS: Yeah, that was her
27 interpretation.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Bill, you're looking for
30 us to take a little action on this or at least comment on
31 this, right?

32
33 MR. KNAUER: You may wish to see if there
34 are any public comments on this and then we are looking
35 for your Council to either reaffirm your previous action
36 or to recommend any modifications to your previous
37 action.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I have no public
40 comments in front of me other than what's in the book
41 here. When I read the public comments in the book, I see
42 there is a lot of interest from all sides in deferring
43 and putting off and a lot of uncertainty over dollar
44 amount. I know, as a Council, we've tried to shut the
45 door on some of the potential abuses that we saw. We
46 tried to honor the people up in our area or up in the
47 Copper Basin that are afraid of the fact that this might
48 grow into something that would attract people and that's
49 one of the reasons that we used the idea that it was for
50 personal family use first and included the 50 percent.

00423

1 I'd be very happy to go along with Fred and say that no
2 more than 30 percent or whatever.

3

4 I think the percentage is up for grabs
5 and I think the dollars are up for grabs, but the ideas
6 that we had behind it was that there should be an
7 economic limit on it, it should be used for family and
8 personal use first and extras can be used for sale and
9 the door should be shut on selling it into any kind of a
10 commercial market. I'd hate to have subsistence-caught
11 Copper River red salmon supplying the Princess Hotel at
12 Copper Center now or something on that order. I think
13 that was kind of the feeling of the whole Council.

14

15 As a Council, do you feel like we can
16 affirm our actions that probably alternative three would
17 be the best? Fred.

18

19 MR. ELVSAAS: You know, I really think
20 that 30 percent of the harvest is reasonable for sale.
21 When you look at 50 percent, you're almost looking at a
22 commercial fishery. I also think that if you're allowed
23 to sell 30 percent of your catch, then you don't want to
24 put a dollar amount on how many fish you can sell, but
25 put a maximum. I think the maximum \$500 is more than
26 sufficient. A thousand is awful high when you look at
27 fish prices and values and so forth. I keep saying look
28 at the price of these five cent humpies. You'd fill this
29 room with \$1,000. I just don't think that's good
30 business. So I would suggest that we amend it to 30
31 percent with a maximum in the aggregate of sales because
32 you're not going to sell it all to one person, I don't
33 believe. I think you'll sell to several individuals with
34 an aggregate of \$500.

35

36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. You can make that
37 as a motion. I have a question to ask on it first. If
38 you put 30 percent, do you think we need -- one of the
39 biggest objections in all of this public comment is an
40 actual dollar amount. If you had a percentage, do you
41 need a dollar amount?

42

43 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, what if you got --
44 say you're selling king salmon to somebody that wants to
45 buy them. I can tell you of an incident in Seldovia
46 where a guy paid \$60 to catch a dog salmon. It was the
47 talk of the town. I missed out. But, anyway, I think
48 just as a guideline, safeguard or whatever you want to
49 call it, if we said no more than 30 percent and not to
50 exceed 500 in aggregate so if you had a couple of good

00424

1 sales you're not looking to catch more to build your
2 percentage up and so forth, especially if you're selling
3 king salmon.

4

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: I'll second the motion.

7

8 MR. ELVSAAS: Well, are we ready for a
9 motion yet? Let's discuss this and see what everybody
10 thinks.

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Susan.

13

14 MS. WELLS: I'm thinking of the \$60
15 analogy there. That can be pretty tempting and I would
16 be concerned about -- you know, \$60 at a whack is great
17 one day and maybe I need \$60 again tomorrow. I'm
18 concerned about having an incentive. I understand
19 replacing my nets and my twine and having to rehang and I
20 need new lead line, but I want to limit the incentive
21 factor to go out and sell because there's an opportunity
22 there. There's always going to be an opportunity to
23 sell.

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: I like the idea of the 30
28 percent and a maximum of \$500 a year. I would think that
29 would put the stoppers on it. I've been very impressed
30 with the language that we've used to eliminate the sale
31 to commercial entities. I think that's one of our very
32 strongest ones. I'm comfortable with the 30 percent and
33 \$500 max. From my perspective, that would answer that
34 and address what Susan's saying. Boy, 60 bucks for a dog
35 salmon, I really would like to get to know this person.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, originally, when
38 we discussed this, one of the biggest concerns to the
39 Copper River Native Association, and Gloria expressed it
40 very clearly, was the fact they didn't want this to be an
41 incentive to attract people to the fishery. Our original
42 number that we were tossing around was \$500. It was just
43 that when we started looking at what other people were
44 saying in other places that we kind of switched to
45 \$1,000.

46

47 MS. WELLS: Five hundred dollars will
48 replace quite a bit of gear.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If the Council feels

00425

1 that the wording that we have covers some of the other
2 concerns that have been expressed in the public comment
3 and wants to change the percentage or the dollar amount,
4 remember that anything we do here is not final. I mean
5 basically what it does is it becomes a starting point.
6 It shows the direction that we think is reasonable. It
7 can be changed in either direction, but it basically
8 shows philosophy. If the Council wants to do that,
9 that's totally acceptable. If I understand what Bill is
10 looking for, it's either for us to affirm what we've done
11 or modify what we've done and give him something to take
12 back to the Board. Susan.

13

14 MS. WELLS: And you've already added that
15 language, page 13, no sale to commercial entities
16 whatsoever, period, amen.

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: Bill, wasn't that your
19 comment, that was a typographical error?

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We voted in a positive,
22 see. We said it could only be sold as long as it is used
23 for personal or family consumption of the individual who
24 purchases the fish. It was a positive way of writing it.
25 Instead of saying thou shalt not, it was saying you can.

26

27 MR. KNAUER: That's correct, Mr. Chair.
28 I'm guessing it was myself that was doing the transition
29 here and I missed that.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, if we would like to
32 reaffirm what we've done and change the amount, a motion
33 is in order.

34

35 MR. ELVSAAS: I would so move that we
36 reaffirm everything that we've done with the exception
37 that the percentage be 30 percent instead of 50 percent
38 and the dollar amount not to exceed \$500 in the
39 aggregate.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

42

43 MS. WELLS: Clarification. The way it
44 reads here, it says at least 50 percent of all fish taken
45 under the Federal subsistence, so that should be changed
46 to 70 percent.

47

48 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right, because it's in
49 the positive. Was there a second?

50

00426

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is there any further
4 discussion? Have we missed anything? So, basically, 70
5 percent will be used for personal or family use and no
6 more than 500 -- now, take a look at what we wrote to
7 begin with -- 500 per individual family member. Is that
8 the sense that I'm getting out of the Council right here?

9

10 MS. WELLS: No. You're saying per
11 household member. So, if we have three in the household,
12 that's pushing the limit up. So you're saying aggregate
13 though, right?

14

15 MR. ELVSAAS: I meant aggregate sales
16 because you can sell 50 here and 100 there and 20 there.

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And ours does require
19 record keeping, which some of them don't. If you're
20 comfortable with that, that's what the motion is on the
21 table. That's what we said in the past.

22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: I am.

24

25 MR. ELVSAAS: I believe at this point I
26 am. The only other way you could do it is to say the
27 permit holder. Somebody with a family may need to do a
28 little more. We've got the 30 percent of the total
29 catch, too. I feel good with it.

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It shows the direction
32 of the philosophy of this Council. Like I said, I think
33 when it all comes out, there's going to be a lot of
34 changes made. It was really interesting to me that we,
35 as a Council, advanced the 50 percent rule and after
36 other Councils looked at that, it showed up in theirs.
37 Bristol Bay advanced the record keeping form on the back
38 of the permit and we took that and said that's a good way
39 to do it. That's what's going to happen out of this.
40 Some of these good points are going to be taken and other
41 areas are going to use them and other areas are going to
42 say, no, we need a different dollar value, we're in a
43 different situation. But, basically, we support
44 alternative three, which is that we recognize that
45 different areas are different.

46

47 So our motion is that we support
48 alternative three, we stick to the changes we made in the
49 past and we change the percentage to keeping 70 percent
50 and the dollar value to \$500.

00427

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Per individual, yes.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that clear enough to
4 write the motion up?

5

6 MR. CHURCHILL: Call the question then.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The question has been
9 called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

10

11 IN UNISON: Aye.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
14 saying nay.

15

16 (No opposing votes)

17

18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Bill, do we need
19 to do anymore on this or have you got direction now?

20

21 MR. KNAUER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
22 think I've gotten direction because by saying that you're
23 supporting alternative three it also indicates to me that
24 you believe paragraph 11, which is transactions between
25 rural residents should remain unlimited and paragraph 13,
26 which prohibits transactions with a fishery business
27 would be prohibited.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right.

30

31 MR. KNAUER: Am I correct in
32 understanding?

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. Yes.

35

36 MR. KNAUER: Thank you.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. With that, we've
39 got 12 done. We're back to 14.4. Bureau of Land
40 Management, trails and easements and other topics. Is
41 there anybody else from BLM besides you here?

42

43 MR. WATERS: That's me.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let's take a break.

46

47 (Off record)

48

49 (On record)

50

00428

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I thought of one other
2 thing we do have to do. We told Sherry that we would
3 look at some of these proposals and see if we wanted to
4 comment on them as a Council, so we'll have to take care
5 of them next. Here we go. It's up to you.

6
7 MR. WATERS: Good afternoon, Mr.
8 Chairman, Council members. I'm speaking today to two
9 things. First of all, speaking on Taylor Brelsford's
10 behalf, he asked me to point out the Trans-Alaska
11 Pipeline renewal EIS. I'll hold it up in case anybody in
12 the audience wants it. I put some extra copies in the
13 back. I think Council have it. He wanted me to point
14 out three things. The web site is at the top of the
15 handout and there's additional information if you'd like
16 additional information on it. And he wanted me to point
17 out the key dates. The public comment period on the
18 draft for the environmental impact statement has already
19 closed. It closed in August. And the final EIS in
20 decision is scheduled for December of 2002, so I guess
21 his point of that is if you have comments or if you want
22 to review it, you don't really have a whole lot of time.
23 With that, I'll move on.

24
25 The next thing I want to talk about is
26 this easements and trail update. I guess this is
27 something that came about because the Council
28 specifically asked for this. I tried to make this as
29 self-briefing as possible and hopefully you've had a
30 chance to read it. I am going to point out a few things
31 about it just to kind of clarify a few things. If you
32 have a question at any time, feel free to interrupt.

33
34 First of all, there's two types of access
35 that the BLM manages and those are trails and easements.
36 They're not the same. Easements provide public access
37 across private land. Of course, Section 17(B) easements
38 provide that public access across Native lands. So, when
39 we're talking about 17(B) easements, we're only talking
40 about Native land.

41
42 The next thing I want to point out is
43 that a lot of times we consider these easements as
44 trails, but, in reality, these easements can be a lot of
45 things besides trails. In fact, the case of the
46 Chistochina River trail, for example, that's actually two
47 easements. That's a one-acre side easement that allows
48 you to park and to stay overnight temporarily or for one
49 night and then the trail is a separate easement. This
50 number, when it says here we administer 210 Section 17(B)

00429

1 easements, a lot of times that's two easements in one.
2 Some of them even have three, like an airstrip, a trail
3 and one-acre side easement that make up one site. So
4 that 210, even though it sounds high, is not as high as
5 you might think.

6

7 The next thing I really want to point out
8 about this is the allowable uses on these easements and
9 what the BLM's regulatory authority is on that. These
10 easements have specific uses that are allowed on those
11 easements. Anything beyond that use is considered an
12 unauthorized use and is a civil trespass against the
13 landowner or the Native corporation. That's where our
14 authority ends. Our regulatory authority deals
15 specifically and only with what's guaranteed by that
16 easement. So those easements are guaranteeing public
17 access. Our regulatory authority allows us to make sure
18 that that public access is there, but it doesn't allow us
19 to enforce anything beyond the use of that.

20

21 For example, I'll use the Chistochina
22 River trail. If our ranger goes by there and somebody is
23 blocking public access, he gets involved and he can write
24 a ticket. If somebody is using that 17(B) easement and
25 going off of that trail, he doesn't go tell him to stay
26 on the trail because as far as he knows, they have the
27 perfect right to go off of that trail. It could be the
28 landowner. So, for example, if he sees Fred out there,
29 he's not going to go ask Fred if he has permission from
30 Ahtna to be off of that trail. That's overstepping his
31 bounds.

32

33 The next thing I want to point out here
34 are the trails. No 17(B) easement currently accesses
35 lands that are open to Federal subsistence users. If you
36 look at the map on page two, those are just trails, not
37 easements. No 17(B) easement accesses lands that are
38 open to Federal hunting. Now trails, on the other hand,
39 there's a lot of trails out there that do access lands
40 that are open to Federal hunting. There's very, very few
41 regulations right now that govern trails or whatever kind
42 of vehicles you can take on those trails. State law lets
43 you go out and put a trail for personal use up to four
44 feet wide pretty much anywhere you want to on State land.
45 That's very few exceptions. It's the same way with BLM.
46 There's nothing that we do, except in very few select
47 areas, that we'll stop anybody from going out there and
48 putting in a trail for personal use. If it's for
49 commercial use, there's other rules that apply. We'd let
50 you take a four-wheeler, ATV, whatever you wanted to,

00430

1 we'd let you take it on the trail.

2

3 I say in very few cases. There's four
4 areas within Unit 13 that there are restrictions to off-
5 road vehicles. Those are the Sourdough Controlled Use
6 Area, Tonsina Controlled Use Area, Delta Controlled Use
7 Area and the Tangle Lakes Archeological District. Three
8 of those are closed by State regulations and one of those
9 is closed by Federal regulations. Out of three of those,
10 the ATV restrictions only apply for hunting. These
11 restriction are not all the same and they vary by season
12 date. I want to point out that those, in most cases, are
13 only for hunting purposes. So if you wanted to go in and
14 put a trail in, you're more than free to do so. You just
15 can't use it for hunting. The other exception to that is
16 the Tangle Lakes Archeological District where you're
17 restricted to existing trails. Again, that only applies
18 to ATVs.

19

20 The other thing I want to point out here,
21 when we look at the land that's available to Federal
22 hunters in Unit 13, 25 percent of that area currently has
23 some kind of ATV restrictions on it. You take those four
24 controlled use areas and that makes up 25 percent of the
25 land that's open to Federal hunters. In reality, it's
26 actually a much bigger percentage because a lot of that
27 land that's included in that 75 percent that's open is
28 inaccessible. It's either glaciers up in the Delta area
29 or it's west fork of the Gulkana River, which is pretty
30 inaccessible to trails or ATVs anyway. So, when you
31 really get down to it, it actually affects more than 25
32 percent of what's readily accessible to Federal hunters.
33 It's more like 50 percent.

34

35 With that said, I want to go into trails
36 maintenance and what we're doing about it. The last
37 several years ATV restrictions has been an issue for
38 years. It keeps coming up every year. I've sat on the
39 panel that selects Advisory Council members and one of
40 the questions that we ask are what would you like to see
41 the Regional Advisory Council address and almost without
42 exception people bring up ATV use. It's a big issue.
43 We've hoped it would go away and it's not, so we are
44 taking steps to address it.

45

46 As you see here in the report, in 2001 we
47 spent \$27,000. This past year we spent \$70,000 on these
48 experimental trail treatments. You know, mainly this
49 Geoblock. We're testing that out. If you look on the
50 last page there, you can see what it looks like a year

00431

1 after. It's designed for some of these wet, boggy areas
2 and it only addresses one aspect of trails and that's the
3 trail widening where people attempt to drive around bad
4 spots. It doesn't address the trail extensions, the fact
5 that new trails come up every year because more and more
6 people have ATVs. But we are attempting some of these
7 pilot projects to address some of the environmental
8 damage of our trails. In fact, next year we are
9 projected to get over \$1 million for trail maintenance.
10 This is coming through in what's called deferred
11 maintenance funds that have come about. The trails are
12 essentially being treated as roads and we're using
13 maintenance money as if they were roads. This is very,
14 very expensive work though. It approaches \$100,000 per
15 mile. It's actually cheaper to build a road. You can go
16 out and put a gravel road into a residential area cheaper
17 than we can maintain these trails.

18

19 The last thing I want to talk about is
20 the resource management plan. The Glennallen field
21 office is currently rewriting a resource management plan.
22 We've been operating under a management plan that's 19
23 years old, almost 20 years old. ATVs weren't really an
24 issue back then. In fact, 20 years ago, if you look at
25 that plan, we were trying to develop access into some of
26 these more remote areas because there wasn't the number
27 of ATVs. We were promoting that access.

28

29 The Federal policy right now, we are
30 required to address ATV use on any new management plan
31 and we are required to put all of that land into one of
32 three categories, either open, closed or limited. Open
33 would be no restrictions on size, where you can take it.
34 Closed, of course, would be closed to any off-road
35 vehicle. Limited, there would be some kind of
36 restrictions placed. It would either be seasonal
37 closures or type of machine closures. We are required to
38 put every piece of land that we manage into one of those
39 categories under our new policy. That plan is scheduled
40 to be completed in early 2004.

41

42 What I would encourage the Council to do is if
43 you feel strongly about this and you feel that there's a
44 place to address it from a subsistence standpoint, I
45 would encourage you to think carefully about a stand on
46 that. You're more than welcome to work through me or
47 Taylor or the Glennallen field office to make sure that
48 those concerns are represented.

49

50 The final thing I want to say is we have

00432

1 increased our staff and we have -- his title is actually
2 recreation planner, but he is the trails recreation
3 planner. His sole job is to work on coordinating these
4 trail inventories and these trail maintenance projects
5 and that kind of thing. So it is something we take
6 seriously and it's something, just to be honest, we're
7 starting to devote quite a bit of money and resources to.
8 With that, I'll answer any questions.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ann.

11

12 MS. WILKINSON: Just briefly, who is that
13 person?

14

15 MR. WATERS: His name is Rod Holbrook.
16 He was just in a terrible car accident. He hit a moose
17 over in Mentasta. Right now both arms are broke.

18

19 MS. WILKINSON: I won't call him tomorrow
20 then.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Mr. Churchill.

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: Elijah, thank you very
25 much. I've been on committees and we've struggled with
26 ATV use. One of the frustrations I know we ran across
27 was we could certainly put limitations in places that
28 related to hunting, but it didn't even come close to
29 dealing with all the recreational use. Is that something
30 that you're struggling with as the land manager or can
31 you be more broad scope?

32

33 MR. WATERS: We can be more broad scope.
34 In fact, that Tangle Lakes Archeological District is a
35 perfect example. You're limited to existing trails,
36 period. That's something that we have considered, just
37 limiting during hunting. I really want us to take our
38 time and it's going to be quite an intensive public
39 outreach because we want to make sure we get it right the
40 first time.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Have you had any concerns
43 or input about the ADA as it would relate to
44 restrictions? Do you have some sort of a device if
45 somebody wanted to make a request under the ADA?

46

47 MR. WATERS: That's something we haven't
48 thought about. That's a good point. In fact, I'm going
49 to make a note here and make sure we capture that and
50 consider it.

00433

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Thank you.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Anybody
4 else? I have a couple questions for Mr. Waters. When
5 you say easements, easements are limited, the
6 unauthorized use of an easement is illegal. What kind of
7 illegal activities do we have on easements?

8

9 MR. WATERS: I have a perfect example.
10 There's three types of trail easements. There's a 30-
11 foot trail easement, a 50-foot trail easement and then
12 120-foot trail easement. On a 30-foot trail easement,
13 you're limited to all-terrain vehicles and anything up to
14 3,000 pounds. Most four-wheelers are significantly less
15 than 3,000 pounds. Then on a 50-foot trail easement,
16 you're allowed essentially anything other than cars.
17 There's no restrictions on tract rigs, weight, anything
18 like that. Then on the 120-foot trail easements, those
19 are for truck and automobile traffic. There's actually
20 housing developments or communities in Glennallen area
21 that the road is actually a 13(B) easement and it allows
22 anything from automobiles down. But unauthorized traffic
23 on some of those easements would be, if it was a 30-foot
24 trail easement and somebody was taking a monster truck on
25 a 30-foot trail easement. That's unauthorized use.

26

27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If you've got a 30 or a
28 50-foot easement, those easements are for transportation
29 only. You can't go down the easement and set up your
30 tent on the easement, can you?

31

32 MR. WATERS: That's exactly right.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So camping on that
35 easement, unless the easement is for that specific
36 purpose, is illegal.

37

38 MR. WATERS: Exactly.

39

40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You can't go five miles
41 in and find a nice wide spot to put up your camp.

42

43 MR. WATERS: Possibly, possibly not.

44

45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Depending on what kind
46 of land you're on.

47

48 MR. WATERS: Exactly.

49

50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: You talk about the

00434

1 Tangle Lakes Archeological. What's the difference
2 between that versus the Wild and Scenic River? Is part
3 of the Tangle Lakes part of the Wild and Scenic River
4 system?

5
6 MR. WATERS: Yes, it is, but there's two
7 different things there. The Wild and Scenic River
8 corridor, of course, is the nationally designated wild
9 river corridor. What the Tangle Lakes Archeological
10 District is -- our archeologist just loves it and I'm
11 sure he'd kill me if he knows how bad I'm going to mess
12 this up, but there's one of the highest concentrations of
13 prehistoric sites there that's in the country. It's
14 always been a really popular area for hunting purposes,
15 so there's a lot of sites and a lot of artifacts. The
16 concern there is that ATV trails damage those sites
17 beyond any value.

18
19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Are these overlapping?

20
21 MR. WATERS: Yes.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Archeological district
24 takes in the Wild and Scenic River.

25
26 MR. WATERS: A portion of it, yes. And
27 it goes well outside that.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, and it goes outside
30 of it in State land and everything.

31
32 MR. WATERS: Right. It goes well outside
33 that Wild and Scenic River corridor onto State-selected
34 land. In fact, that's part of what's on the State's
35 priority list for land conveyance. So part of that is
36 probably going to go away by next year. It will be in
37 State hands. It will no longer be a Tangle Lakes Federal
38 Archeological District. I'm sure the State will manage
39 it similar.

40
41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But isn't the Wild and
42 Scenic River corridor inside that area part of the
43 archeological district too?

44
45 MR. WATERS: Yes. That will remain in
46 BLM and there's no designated trails in that and under
47 Wild River managements, ATVs aren't allowed.

48
49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So, under Wild and
50 Scenic, ATVs aren't allowed. I notice there's a couple

00435

1 places that ATV trails go down to the Gulkana River.

2

3 MR. WATERS: Existing trails I should
4 clarify. You can only drive ATVs in the Wild and Scenic
5 River corridor on existing trails.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If the existing trails
8 were there before the Wild and Scenic River was there,
9 then you can use ATVs.

10

11 MR. WATERS: Right.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And on the idea of
14 creating these trails, have you looked into using bike
15 path equipment?

16

17 MR. WATERS: What are you calling bike
18 path equipment?

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, when Tony Knowles
21 is building all these bike paths all over the state, they
22 had to come up with miniaturized road equipment to build
23 and maintain these bike paths. I mean they've got
24 little, small dump trucks, they've got little small Cats,
25 they've got little small packers. I mean it's all stuff
26 that doesn't fit on a normal road but fits on a bike
27 path.

28

29 MR. WATERS: That's some of the stuff
30 we're renting. And I wanted to point out the existing
31 ATV regulations, there's only four areas in Unit 13 where
32 they're restricted and those four areas just happen to be
33 in the subsistence hunting areas.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions?
36 Fred.

37

38 MR. ELVSAAS: You said on the trail
39 easements, if there's trespass issues, you don't enforce
40 it, but if the landowner blocks the trail, you do.

41

42 MR. WATERS: Right.

43

44 MR. ELVSAAS: Is that square?

45

46 MR. WATERS: That's what I was trying to
47 explain. We'll take Tad Kehl, for example, who's the CEO
48 of Ahtna. If he gets on a 17(B) easement and gets off of
49 that easement onto Ahtna land, he's the CEO, I'm sure he
50 has permission, so he doesn't want a ranger going around

00436

1 essentially trespassing to make sure that he's legal, so
2 we don't enforce that. You can go get a permit from the
3 private landowner to be on that private land, so it's not
4 our ranger's place to be going around seeing who has a
5 permit to be on that private land and who doesn't. We're
6 only concerned with what's granted in that conveyance
7 document, that 17(B) easement that allows public access
8 across that trail or that easement to public lands.
9

10 MR. ELVSAAS: You got a little off. In
11 our particular case, we have a foot trail and it's
12 roughly two feet wide, but BLM says the easement is 25
13 feet or 30 feet wide. Now, in the easement, it says
14 existing trail, it doesn't say 20 feet off the trail.
15 Now, when somebody gets off the trail, they're
16 trespassing.

17
18 MR. WATERS: Right.

19
20 MR. ELVSAAS: But BLM says, oh, no, we're
21 not going to enforce that, but if we blocked the trail,
22 then how do you enforce it? Do you come and remove the
23 barricade?

24
25 MR. WATERS: Remove the barricade.
26 There's really not a whole lot of cases of people
27 blocking access. These trail heads, the easements are
28 pretty well known and they've been used for a long time.
29 In four years, to my knowledge, there's never been a case
30 of somebody trying to deny public access on those 17(B)
31 easements.

32
33 MR. ELVSAAS: We don't deny public
34 access. What we have a problem with is this trail is a
35 foot path and it goes down a very steep hill, across the
36 flats and up to the river and to the lake. Now BLM says
37 you can drive a four-wheeler on this trail. The problem
38 is nobody can drive a four-wheeler down this mountain and
39 they want BLM to fix it. We don't want four-wheelers on
40 the trail.

41
42 MR. WATERS: I hear what you're saying
43 and I think it's kind of a practical aspect versus what
44 the conveyance document says, but the minimum 17(B)
45 easement that we have, the minimum trail standard for a
46 17(B) easement allows four-wheeler access on all of them.
47 Legally, if they wanted to take a four-wheeler, they
48 could, because that's just the minimum. As long as it's
49 less than 3,000 pounds, that's allowed.

50

00437

1 MR. ELVSAAS: Now we're getting to what
2 my interest is here. Now you're going to allow the four-
3 wheelers on this trail down the hill. Somebody gets
4 killed. Are you responsible?

5
6 MR. WATERS: No, we wouldn't be
7 responsible.

8
9 MR. ELVSAAS: Why not? You allowed it.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The Federal government.

12
13 MR. WATERS: Yeah, the Federal government
14 allowed it.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But you're not
17 responsible either because the easement is not your land.

18
19 MR. WATERS: Right.

20
21 MR. ELVSAAS: It's forced on us.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Right. But what I mean
24 is that easement remains your land, but the easement
25 becomes Federal property, right?

26
27 MR. WATERS: The easement is managed by
28 Federal.

29
30 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the land
31 remains.....

32
33 MR. WATERS: The land remains the private
34 landowner.

35
36 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But the private
37 landowner no longer has liability for what happens, do
38 they?

39
40 MR. WATERS: No.

41
42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now this is the question
43 that I've got. Let's say they've got a 30-foot easement.
44 Somebody goes halfway down the easement and decides they
45 want to go off and go camping. If you go by, you don't
46 enforce that because your authority ends at the edge of
47 the easement, but you're also law enforcement officers.
48 If they call in and file a complaint and you or your man
49 are the law enforcement officer going down there, they've
50 called in and said we have a trespass complaint two miles

00438

1 down the trail, then does your man enforce that trespass?

2

3 MR. WATERS: No. He doesn't have
4 jurisdiction for that. That's State jurisdiction, not
5 Federal.

6

7 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Now, if he was a
8 Forest Service, then he has jurisdiction because he has
9 the same authority to enforce State law, that's what the
10 guy just told us, he is the same as a State Trooper, he
11 can enforce State law and Federal law. The BLM policeman
12 can't do that.

13

14 MR. WATERS: We have a reciprocal
15 agreement and it's specific to different things. For
16 example, our Federal guy can write State violations for
17 some things but not for others. I'm not a law
18 enforcement expert, but he calls them titles. There's
19 different titles that he has reciprocal agreements with
20 and others that he doesn't. Trespass is not one of them.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Did you have a question?

23

24 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, more on a different
25 subject that we covered earlier. In the selection
26 process, part of that was an interview process and I know
27 Mr. Waters participates in that and I wanted to ask a
28 couple questions about that. How often does this come
29 up? How many of these interviews have you done?

30

31 MR. WATERS: We go through the selection
32 process once a year.

33

34 MR. CHURCHILL: Is that part of your job
35 description? Other duties as assigned?

36

37 MR. WATERS: It's other duties as
38 assigned. Ann kind of recruits a group of people who
39 participates in that as she twists their arm.

40

41 MR. CHURCHILL: Having worked with Ann in
42 a variety of capacities with the Advisory Committee, she
43 does a wonderful job of making sure we do right things.
44 I guess what I'd like to do, through the Chair, if the
45 Chair agrees, is just complement you on that effort and
46 thank you on the record. That's not an easy job and I
47 certainly appreciate you going through that. Thank you.

48

49 MR. WATERS: Thank you.

50

00439

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
2 Elijah?

3

4 MR. WATERS: I just have one question on
5 trails and easements. I wasn't at the last meeting and
6 it kind of caught Taylor off guard when you guys asked
7 for an update, but is this something that you want at
8 every Council meeting, an update or a status of where we
9 are on our trails maintenance or our RMP process? What
10 are your expectations?

11

12 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: As long as I'm here, I'd
13 like to have it because I know how important it is. It's
14 one of the hot issues up in Unit 13 amongst the Native
15 community. As far as I'm concerned, I'd like to know
16 what's going on with it.

17

18 MR. WATERS: Okay. We'll continue to
19 give you an update then.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I'll be real interested
22 when you get into where you start making the new
23 management thing and see what your process is for
24 deciding what's open, what's closed and what's limited
25 and what's meant by limited. That's going to be a
26 process that I don't envy the fact you've got to go
27 through.

28

29 MR. WATERS: Even the people who use ATVs
30 still tell us that we have to address it one way or the
31 other.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you.

34

35 MR. WATERS: Thank you.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Tom. Last, but not
38 lease. Do we have somebody from Wildlife here or are you
39 just going to present that?

40

41 MR. TAUBE: No, there won't be any
42 presentation. Mr. Chairman, Council members. For the
43 record, my name is Tom Taube. I'm the area management
44 biologist for the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. I'm
45 responsible for sportfish management and the Upper Copper
46 River State subsistence fisheries. I had passed out two
47 separate documents to you. One was a synopsis of the
48 State subsistence fisheries and then this morning you
49 would have received a couple tables regarding the
50 sportfish harvest.

00440

1 I'll try to briefly summarize these
2 things. I've included some of the historical perspective
3 as we have two new Council members this year that weren't
4 involved last fall when the summary came out. There's a
5 brief description of the history behind the Chitina and
6 Glennallen subdistrict, a reference to the various
7 management plans.

8
9 On Table 1, it's the harvest for the last
10 17 years in the Chitina subdistrict. The fishery just
11 ended three days ago, so there's no preliminary
12 information for the Chitina subdistrict as of yet. I'm
13 anticipating probably eight to nine thousand State
14 participants in the Chitina subdistrict this past year.
15 For 2001, we had nearly 9,500 participants or permits
16 issued. That was the third highest on record since 1984.
17 The total harvest was the fourth highest at around
18 136,000 fish.

19
20 On Table 2, in the Glennallen
21 subdistrict, this year we issued 1,119 permits. That is
22 down from previous years. In 2001, we issued 1,239
23 permits, which was the second highest we've issued. The
24 harvest of 87,000 was the highest we've had for the
25 Glennallen subdistrict.

26
27 Several other tables in here show the
28 breakdown by area for the Glennallen and Chitina
29 subdistrict. In 2001, the Glennallen subdistrict, Copper
30 Basin residents represented 30 percent of the
31 participants. Of those 30 percent, they harvest about 50
32 percent of the harvest for that subdistrict, but that
33 percentage has declined over time as we see more
34 Anchorage residents, Mat-Su residents, Fairbanks
35 residents come in since the McDowell decision in 1990.
36 In the Chitina subdistrict, Copper Basin residents
37 represent a pretty small percentage of the participants,
38 usually about one percent.

39
40 One thing that isn't broken down here,
41 there are some Federally-qualified communities that are
42 not under the Copper Basin percentage. They probably
43 represent just a few more percentage points that would
44 fall under Federally-qualified.

45
46 Table 4 just shows the breakdown of the
47 Chitina subdistrict fishery schedule for this past year.
48 As Eric stated, there were eight special actions. With
49 the State, we actually had nine emergency orders. The
50 week of July 28th, there was a surplus of 50,000-plus

00441

1 pass the sonar and under State regulation we issue a
2 supplemental permit at that time that allows for an
3 additional 10 fish to be harvested on the State permit.

4

5 The next table just shows the gear
6 distribution in the Glennallen subdistrict fishery.
7 We've seen an increase in dipnet permits issued and
8 that's partly responsible due to the change in 1999 by
9 the Board of Fisheries. If you look back at the
10 participation level, we did see a boost up in 2000 of
11 participation in Glennallen subdistrict for that same
12 reason. There's some attraction for some of the Chitina
13 subdistrict users that want to have an uninterrupted
14 fishery where they can start fishing June 1st and not
15 have the openings and closings, so we've seen some
16 movement from the Chitina into the Glennallen subdistrict
17 under the state use.

18

19 And the other tables, there's just some
20 more information, seeing what our allocation of the range
21 was set aside and how the total harvest has fallen within
22 that. You can see that in the late 1990s, the 100,000
23 allocation, when it was personal use, was exceeded for
24 three years and that partly was caused by the real strong
25 sockeye return we had in those years.

26

27 The second handout was the sportfish
28 harvest for the area. I believe the first page, sockeye
29 harvests, we're just getting our 2001 estimates and I
30 think they were right around 11,000 for sockeye, so it
31 sort of stabilized the last few years right around 11-
32 12,000 sockeye harvested. It's about a 50/50 split
33 between the Klutina River drainage and the Gulkana River
34 drainage from where those sockeye are taken.

35

36 The next two tables are harvest of
37 chinook and catch of chinook. Chinook harvest increased
38 in the mid-1990s. We thought we were going to see that
39 again this year. Luckily, Mother Nature cooperated. We
40 had some high water events and fishing kind of slowed
41 down on the Gulkana. The first weekend or second weekend
42 of June there was a lot more effort on the Gulkana and
43 that was more anecdotal information. We don't have an
44 ongoing creel survey on that system or either system. It
45 just appeared there was a lot more. The Gulkana harvest
46 will probably be at or below average for the last year,
47 around 3-4,000 fish.

48

49 The Klutina has recently seen a lot more
50 increase in harvest in the last few years. If you look

00442

1 at 2000, that drop was due to high water conditions on
2 the Klutina. From our perspective, a lot of times the
3 environment can help allow more fish on the spawning
4 grounds and really impact the sport fisheries up in the
5 Upper Copper River. Some of these declines in harvest
6 are from regulatory action. We've gone from a five fish
7 seasonal bag limit to a four fish seasonal bag limit in
8 1999. In 2000, there was also some in-season action
9 where we restricted the bag limit from four to two due to
10 what looked like a less than average return for Upper
11 Copper River chinook stocks.

12

13 That's really all I have on the harvest
14 information. Just some other auxiliary information. We
15 did have two projects that were funded by Federal
16 subsistence dollars in the Upper Copper that were
17 conducted by Sportfish. One was the radio telemetry
18 project for chinook salmon for determining spawning
19 distribution and coming up with an estimate for total
20 escapement. This was the fourth year this year. 2001
21 was the only year from 1999 to 2001 where the spawning
22 escapement of chinook salmon in the Upper Copper River
23 fell within the range that the Board of Fisheries applied
24 in the 1999 meeting of 28-55,000 for an escapement range.
25 Actually, it was one out of two years we met the
26 escapement goal.

27

28 The second project we had was a steelhead
29 rainbow trout project conducted on the Hanagita River and
30 also the Upper Gulkana River. We had weirs at both
31 sites. A spring weir at the Gulkana River counting
32 rainbow trout spawners and steelhead spawners. That was
33 a two-year project that finalized this year. Hanagita
34 was a two-year project also, but that was a fall weir and
35 that finalized this year at the Gulkana. Each year it
36 was approximately several hundred steelhead that were in
37 that area downstream of Dickey Lake and the Hungry Hollow
38 area.

39

40 One related project on the Gulkana was a
41 radiotelemetry study with rainbow trout that we used to
42 locate more spawning areas and actually hoping that the
43 rainbow trout may be like Judas fish to show some other
44 steelhead spawning areas. We did locate one additional
45 spawning area at Twelve Mile Creek down in the main stem,
46 about midway between the west fork and the middle fork
47 and we have a proposal in to the Board of Fishery to
48 close that spawning area during the spawning season.

49

50 This year, as mentioned earlier, we did

00443

1 have a weir on the Gulkana River to count chinook salmon.
2 It was the first year. We're looking at it as a five-
3 year project with the hopeful expansion for long-term
4 data to establish a BEG for chinook salmon or biological
5 escapement goal for chinook salmon in the Gulkana River.
6 We counted slightly over 6,000 salmon as preliminary
7 numbers and there was some number tweaking because the
8 water muddied up a little bit, but overall it was a
9 successful project for the first year.

10

11 Other projects, we did conduct some
12 grayling work in the Upper Gulkana, some stock
13 assessment, some lake trout work this fall at Paxson Lake
14 to do some initial population estimate and apply it to a
15 lake area model that we use for yield for lake trout.
16 And that wraps it up pretty much for projects we
17 conducted. There are over 50 proposals directed to Upper
18 Copper River subsistence and sport fisheries at the Board
19 of Fisheries. I expect you don't want to go through them
20 all.

21

22 One thing I may add is the reference to
23 the marking of the fish wheels. Our initial preliminary
24 response to that State proposal, we discussed with Fish &
25 Wildlife Protection what would work for them to go with a
26 non-name plate on the fish wheel. What we're presenting
27 to the Board tentatively right now is that we would use
28 driver's license or permanent ID numbers in place of name
29 plates and that would actually become the person's permit
30 number. They would still have the option of allowing
31 people to put their name if they so desire, but this
32 would provide the protection guy immediate access to who
33 is on that wheel. They would not be required to get back
34 to the Fish & Game office or Park Service office to get
35 that list of users that have authorization. They could
36 just call into dispatch. The only people that have
37 access to that are the troopers and protection officers.
38 So that's a solution we're hoping the Board will approve
39 and we'll try to report all that to you at the spring
40 meeting.

41

42 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That sounds like a very
43 workable thing. Tom, I missed something here some place
44 along the line. The difference between catch and
45 harvest.

46

47 MR. TAUBE: Harvest are fish that are
48 retained in the bag limit. Catch are those that are
49 released. Actually, the harvest is a subset of the
50 catch. I do know that in 2001 the harvest for the Upper

00444

1 Copper for chinook was 4,900, so it dropped down a little
2 bit.

3

4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Another question.

5 Hanagita has a lake system, Gulkana has a lake system.

6 Are most of your steelhead connected with lake systems?

7 Do they over-winter in the lake or do they over-winter in
8 the river?

9

10 MR. TAUBE: There's evidence, at least

11 what we saw with the Gulkana, that there is some over-

12 wintering in Dickie Lake with steelhead. That's one area

13 we like to see more work done possibly with

14 radiotelemetry. We have limited information on the

15 distribution of steelhead. Since they're on the fringe

16 of where their distribution is, a lot of times these

17 populations are relatively small. We've even had some

18 anecdotal information from the Tanana Creek weir. They

19 have, at Hanagita, moved up and they spawn above the

20 lower lake. Originally, they had spawned right down at

21 the outlet of the lower lake and with the high water

22 event that occurred there, the spawning area was somewhat

23 destroyed and they moved up. We haven't caught any

24 resident rainbows in Hanagita. We're seeing them pass

25 through the weir, so it pretty much looks like it's all

26 steelhead. Why that occurs, we're uncertain.

27

28 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's hard to figure out

29 why some of the smolt don't stay and become resident.

30 I've never heard of resident rainbows, but I have seen

31 steelhead in the lake ice fishing in the wintertime, so I

32 know they're in the lake. They weren't before and that's

33 why I was wondering if the evidence was they over-winter

34 in the lake and drop back into the streams or do some

35 over-winter in the lake and some over-winter in the

36 streams.

37

38 MR. TAUBE: It appears that there is

39 both. Like in the Gulkana there's certain deep holes

40 where you can find them. And just from the weir, there

41 are those that are moving past the weir. But where we've

42 seen the evidence is that we find fish up above the weir

43 when we put the weir in early enough and we haven't seen

44 fish for days before they pass the weir and all of a

45 sudden these fish are up there. So we're assuming they

46 reside in the lake over-winter. In talking with some of

47 the biologists that have worked down in Southeast with

48 some of the steelhead populations down there, they've

49 seen the same thing.

50

00445

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Have you been able to
2 identify what kind of habitat they use for spawning so
3 that you're able to protect that kind of habitat or is
4 the habitat a fairly widespread habitat?

5
6 MR. TAUBE: It appears that where there
7 may be springs coming in or upwellings will indicate
8 areas where they spawn. That area below Dickie Lake
9 there's a lot of off-ice that occurs there. Some of the
10 years we were sampling we were dealing with eight feet of
11 ice we were having to climb down and try to locate the
12 fish. So that seemed to be something that they were
13 drawn to for spawning, was having an upwelling and the
14 spring that occur there.

15
16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: And the spawning takes
17 place like in April, doesn't it?

18
19 MR. TAUBE: Yes. They start showing up
20 -- we're usually out there with the weir about the first
21 of May and there may be a few fish that are up there at
22 that time, but they do start moving in around the first
23 of May part and will continue towards about mid May and
24 after that period they've already started to drop out.
25 After mid May you start seeing fish dropping down.

26
27 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Most of our steelhead
28 that come to our interior rivers run up and fall, don't
29 they, so they have to over-winter some place, spawn and
30 drop back out in the spring.

31
32 MR. TAUBE: That's correct. I have
33 talked with some folks when lining was more popular on
34 the Copper River 20 years ago that they were catching
35 steelhead underneath the ice with set lines. Most of
36 what we see is that they seem to come up -- Hanagita, for
37 example, it seems like most of them do come up to the
38 lake. If you fly over Hanagita, it's a pretty rough
39 stretch down to the T-bay. So, unless there's a few that
40 reside down in the T-bay and then move up in the spring,
41 but every indication with Hanagita is they do come up in
42 the fall and reside up there.

43
44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: So these were set lines
45 under the ice for burbot?

46
47 MR. TAUBE: For burbot, yes, that they
48 picked up steelhead on. There's some deep holes in the
49 lower Gulkana where we've seen them into October and
50 we're assuming a few of those reside in the river. So I

00446

1 think it may depend on the system itself. I know with
2 grayling a lot of times they'll go in areas where there's
3 springs, as long as there's movement in there. They do
4 kind of go dormant in the wintertime and as long as
5 there's water moving through there and the oxygen,
6 they'll reside in relatively shallow or thin water.

7

8 MR. TAUBE: I always watch where the
9 otters go and I've never found a steelhead carcass yet.
10 I just figured they must be wintering some place other
11 than the river itself.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Thank you. Any other
14 questions for Tom?

15

16 MR. ELVSAAS: Does steelhead go back to
17 sea?

18

19 MR. TAUBE: Yeah, there's a percentage
20 that do survive spawning and go back out. Not all of
21 them do, but you will find carcasses along certain areas.
22 It's a relatively high percentage. I think 60 percent or
23 something is what I've seen in studies.

24

25 MR. ELVSAAS: So some winter in lakes,
26 some probably in the river and some go on our to sea then

27

28 MR. TAUBE: Well, they'll go out to sea
29 after they spawn in the spring. For example, the fish
30 that were probably being caught in the fish wheels in May
31 are out-migrants. They've spawned and they're going
32 down. They're very skinny, very lethargic and they'll
33 just be letting the current take them down.

34

35 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: But they're not in
36 edible shape.

37

38 MR. TAUBE: Yeah. And they necessarily
39 don't spawn every year.

40

41 MR. ELVSAAS: I had just thought they
42 always come in, spawn and went back to sea.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Most of them come in in
45 Alaska in the fall and spawn in the spring, so they have
46 to over-winter in fresh water and then they take off and
47 go back out. A lot of your cutthroats do the same thing.
48 What is kind of the record? I know down in Southeast the
49 steelhead are a lot bigger. They come back a lot more
50 often. The steelhead from the Gulkana has a harder trip

00447

1 getting up there and a lot harder trip getting back to
2 the ocean.

3

4 MR. TAUBE: We've only seen a handful the
5 second time around. A lot of that is just because we've
6 only been tagging for about four years in the Gulkana.

7

8 MR. CHURCHILL: So the second time
9 around.

10

11 MR. TAUBE: I think we've seen like two
12 fish twice.

13

14 MR. CHURCHILL: Oh. So we're not talking
15 four times or something like that.

16

17 MR. TAUBE: Well, they may be coming
18 back, it's just that we're not there to catch them. If
19 you're interested, I think ADF&G put out a study on the
20 Situk if I remember correctly. It has the highest
21 percentage of multi-year spawners of steelhead of any
22 that's been measured. I may be able to drag that out if
23 you don't have it, but it does make pretty interesting
24 reading along the lines that you've been chatting about.
25 I'd expect you'd be able to get that online. All the
26 Fish & Game reports would be online and if you just typed
27 in Situk as the key word, you'd be able to get it.

28

29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other questions for
30 Tom? Okay. That completes our reports. We have only
31 one other thing that's on our agenda before we go on to
32 election of officers and somebody else could take this
33 job. Ann.

34

35 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. It is a
36 quarter after 4:00. If you wanted to be out by 5:00,
37 could I please suggest that we do the rest of the agenda
38 and then go to that subject to be sure we get these
39 things done? Would that be okay?

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. We're going to go
42 on to the last of our agenda, except for the adjourn, and
43 then we're going to see if we have time to hit these
44 proposals just for a few minutes to see if we want to
45 make any comment to the Board of Fish or Board of Game
46 on. With that, we go to election of officers. Susan.

47

48 MS. WELLS: I'd like to nominate Ralph
49 for Chair.

50

00448

1 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
4 seconded to nominate me, Ralph Lohse, for the Chair. Is
5 there any other nominations?

6

7 MS. WELLS: I'd like to make a motion to
8 close on nominations.

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

11

12 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

13

14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
15 seconded to close nominations. All in favor signify by
16 saying aye.

17

18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19

20 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: All opposed signify by
21 saying nay.

22

23 (No opposing votes)

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Motion carries. Thank
26 you. I don't even know if I was supposed to operate that
27 one. We now need a nomination for vice Chair.

28

29 MS. WELLS: Well, I will make a motion to
30 nominate Fred Elvsaas for vice Chair and Robert Churchill
31 for secretary and lets get this done with.

32

33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do I hear a second?

34

35 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure.

36

37 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
38 seconded to nominate Fred as vice Chair and Bob as
39 secretary and there's a second to it. Are there any
40 further nominations?

41

42 MS. WELLS: No. I'll ask that they be
43 closed.

44

45 MR. CHURCHILL: Second.

46

47 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's been a motion to
48 close nominations. There's a second for it. All in
49 favor signify by saying aye.

50

00449

1 IN UNISON: Aye.

2

3 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Election of officers is
4 over. Those four people that weren't here, we should
5 have elected them to the office.

6

7 MR. CHURCHILL: They don't know what we
8 did, do they?

9

10 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Annual report.
11 Items for the annual report. Concerns that people have.
12 One of the concerns I've heard expressed is the
13 subsistence fishery on the Kenai and information
14 regarding that. We've heard expressions of concerns
15 about ATV. The need to collect information from the
16 elders while the elders are still here. Anybody else
17 have any items? Bob.

18

19 MR. CHURCHILL: Yeah, I'd like to include
20 in it our discussion and efforts of working more closely
21 with the State Advisory Committees, so I'd like to make
22 sure we include that.

23

24 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Any other items
25 that you feel we should put on our reports? I have one
26 that's been brought up many, many times by people in the
27 Interior and that's predator control and that goes along
28 with one of the things that's on our table right here,
29 the continued attempt to expand predator protection at
30 the expense of the subsistence community. Ann.

31

32 MS. WILKINSON: On these topics, since
33 I'm going to write from a two-word subject, I'd like just
34 a little bit -- it's not hard to find history of comments
35 on this Council's views on ATV use. That's real
36 apparent. The Cook Inlet subsistence study is being
37 conducted and there are schedules being updated every
38 meeting. Do you want to bring this up in your annual
39 report? What would you like to say about it?

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, I wasn't thinking
42 so much of the study, Ann, as I was thinking of what I
43 heard expressed is the need to provide subsistence
44 opportunity in the Cook Inlet area or the need to provide
45 as much available opportunity as is possible or something
46 to that effect. That's kind of the concerns I've heard
47 from Fred and Susan. Not so much that the study needs to
48 be done as the fact that opportunity needs to be
49 provided.

50

00450

1 MS. WILKINSON: And the part with the
2 predator control, you have a history of that, too.

3
4 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have a history of
5 that, but especially, in my way of thinking, after seeing
6 what's in front of the Board right now, is the continued
7 pressure for expansion of predator protection at the
8 expense of the subsistence community. In other words,
9 placing much more value on the predator than on the
10 people that live in the area.

11
12 MS. WILKINSON: Okay. Thank you.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Anything else you can
15 think of to put on the annual report?

16
17 MS. WELLS: I think it's been very
18 productive to go into the communities, to hear from the
19 communities.

20
21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: In other words, the
22 added expense of having our meetings in outlying
23 communities instead of Anchorage we feel is worthwhile
24 and we need sufficient funding for that kind of stuff.

25
26 MS. WELLS: It's very productive to hear
27 right from the people and their own areas of concern.

28
29 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I think one of the
30 things that should be as a concern as we face the future
31 is with our expanded Council and the expanded expense of
32 holding meetings, there's going to be a tendency to
33 either cut down on the number of meetings or cut down on
34 the number of days or limit where we can have them. I
35 realize that something like coming to Cordova is a big
36 expense. I can't imagine how much bigger it would be if
37 there was 13 of us and we were all here. But a concern
38 that sufficient -- with the expansion of the Councils
39 that they're asking for, that sufficient funding be made
40 available so that it doesn't limit our options on
41 meetings and meeting places. Mr. Churchill.

42
43 MR. CHURCHILL: Well, I think it goes a
44 bit further than that, too. I mean when you essentially
45 double the number of people involved and, as we've heard
46 testimony, funding remains static and we don't have a lot
47 of meeting days per year. That, frankly, scares me. It
48 potentially could be crippling to -- even if we had all
49 our meetings in Anchorage. I'd like to see us dig into
50 that a bit. To me, it's an unfunded mandate. We have

00451

1 the folks saying that we need to essentially double the
2 number of people we have involved. That really concerns
3 me.

4

5 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Maybe we have a wrong
6 impression. Bill is here to correct us or explain
7 something to us. Fred.

8

9 MR. ELVSAAS: Before he tells us he's got
10 millions. I read the thing and if we have a true Council
11 that is seven or 13 and we're through the region, it
12 costs just as much to go to Anchorage as it does to go
13 out of Anchorage. You know, more people, it's going to
14 cost more money.

15

16 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I meant.

17

18 MR. ELVSAAS: We're not going to save
19 money by meeting in Anchorage only. Look at the distance
20 you have to travel, no matter where. So I don't see
21 meeting in Anchorage as a cost-saver. Didn't we set some
22 kind of agreement that we'd meet once a year in Anchorage
23 and the fall meetings would be in the outlying areas?

24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I don't know that we had
26 an agreement. That was kind of an understanding. Ann,
27 you had something on that? No. Bill is going to tell us
28 the pocket is unlimited and there's no problem, right?

29

30 MR. KNAUER: Right. I'm from the
31 government, I'm here to help you and your check is in the
32 mail. Mr. Chairman, this is a good segue into the very
33 next topic because it talks about Regional Council
34 meetings and there is a letter from Tom in your booklet
35 under Tab I. It's intended to open a dialogue between
36 the Regional Councils about some concerns that have been
37 raised about some meeting locations and conflicts with
38 scheduling. Now, we know that some regions are not
39 likely to be affected by this letter. In those regions,
40 meetings are generally being held in regional hubs or in
41 areas where there is ease of access, such as roads, and
42 there is a presence of commercial facilities to house the
43 increased staff and Council members that we're needing at
44 these meetings.

45

46 Some of the regions have greater or
47 lesser problems than others. If you think about it,
48 since October of '99, our program, staff and
49 responsibilities have increased dramatically with the
50 addition of fisheries, the complexity, the number of

00452

1 people we're meeting with, the organizations such as
2 YRDFA, National Marine Fishery Service and new public,
3 such as the commercial and sport fisherman, the
4 transporters and guides. There is much greater interest.
5 Additionally, even working with Alaska Department of Fish
6 & Game, we're dealing with new divisions, Comm Fish and
7 Sport Fish. With those new interests and concerns, not
8 only are more people interested in coming to our
9 meetings, but you need more technical staff to provide
10 you the information. The fishery biologist, our
11 fisheries information staff.

12

13 There are concerns that in some of the
14 communities there might not be adequate facilities to
15 house both the additional staff or agencies and there
16 might be cost to the public -- not just to the
17 government, but to the public to attend these meetings
18 and be able to provide their input that you so value. On
19 occasion, we recognize that there may be a significant
20 issue or need to hold a meeting in a very, very small,
21 remote community. There may be situations where the
22 Council chair and additional members may wish to go into
23 a community on their own ahead of time.

24

25 The other thing that we need to think
26 about in scheduling is that the staff for this Council
27 and the other Councils serve more than one region.
28 Therefore, the Council needs to, and has in the past,
29 been very considerate regarding the scheduling of
30 meetings so that their staff is not in a situation where
31 two of the Council meetings that they support either
32 overlap or are back to back so that there are
33 difficulties. This region is fortunate in that most of
34 the communities in the region, particularly those that
35 have a strong use of Federal lands, are fairly
36 accessible, fairly road accessible. The weather is such
37 generally that it is not as limiting as in some of the
38 other areas and most of the communities are of such size
39 or location or interest that they generally have
40 facilities to house a number of people. So this region
41 is in pretty good shape in that regard. But we wish you
42 to be aware of these things. As Peggy said, our budget
43 we expect to be static, but we do expect to be able to
44 accommodate the Council's needs as far as scheduling
45 their meetings and accommodating your increased Council,
46 so we think we'll be able to cover that.

47

48 MR. CHURCHILL: I appreciate your
49 confidence. I don't share it quite yet, but I appreciate
50 it. I'm still just as concerned as I was before and I

00453

1 know you guys do yeoman's duties and it's great, but,
2 again, when you double the need and keep the resource
3 supported the same, I still think it bears -- it's an
4 unfunded mandate that should be addressed.

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's a concern that we
7 can put in our annual report. If nothing else, to bring
8 it to the attention of those that are higher up than the
9 Staff we have to work with and that do as much of a job
10 that they do. Hopefully to make their job easier in the
11 future and, if nothing else, to explain why things maybe
12 don't work as smooth as they did before if it doesn't
13 work, you know. I like your idea of including the words
14 unfunded mandate in our report. I feel it is an unfunded
15 mandate to the Staff to try to do twice as much with the
16 same amount.

17

18 MR. CHURCHILL: I've been down this road
19 with the Advisory Committee system and I think it needs
20 to be addressed quickly.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Any other thing that we
23 feel the need to put into our annual report? I'd like to
24 put in our annual report thanks for the support we have
25 had in the past from our Staff and from all of the
26 different agencies and the jobs that they've done to try
27 to provide us with information and meet our needs. I
28 think they need recognition from that standpoint.
29 Anything else? I guess that will be our annual report
30 unless we can think of something. If somebody thinks of
31 something that's needed in the annual report, give me or
32 Bob a call and we'll make sure Ann gets it.

33

34 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. When I do
35 write up the draft that I will send a copy out to all the
36 Council members, please feel free to edit.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Edit or add.

39

40 MS. WILKINSON: Just send it back to me
41 when you've done that and I can make those changes.

42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Next thing on the
44 agenda. Establish a time and place for the next meeting.
45 Taking in account what Bill just said, we're going to
46 pick some place like Seldovia. Bill.

47

48 MR. KNAUER: Mr. Chairman. One thing,
49 because we're dealing with so many entities now, they're
50 asking that the Councils try to pick not only where their

00454

1 next meeting will be and the dates, but look a year out
2 for the fall. That's not to say that things can't
3 change, but it does allow particularly the Advisory
4 Committees to try and adjust their meetings or the Board
5 of Game or the Board of Fish to adjust so that their
6 staff are available for Council meetings also.

7

8 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Fred.

9

10 MR. ELVSAAS: Before we were going to
11 come to Cordova we were going to meet in Glennallen and
12 for some reason we didn't.

13

14 MS. WILKINSON: We were going to meet in
15 Cantwell and the reason we didn't was because at the time
16 of year we were going to have the meeting many of the
17 lodges were closed down, so people would have had to have
18 gone as much as 20 to 30 miles to get enough lodging
19 unless they didn't mind sleeping three to a room or four
20 to a room with people they didn't know, so that was a
21 problem.

22

23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We have met in
24 Glennallen, we have met in Copper Center, we've met in
25 Mentasta, we've met in Cordova.

26

27 MS. WILKINSON: If we try going on the
28 other side, we should talk to CIRI about keeping the
29 place open.

30

31 MR. ELVSAAS: Talkeetna? They're
32 shutting it down this winter.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the problem we
35 run into. Our schedule is at a time of the year that it
36 would be lovely to go back to Copper Center right now
37 because Copper Center now has this beautiful hotel with
38 wonderful restaurant facilities, but it's closed. And
39 that's what we start running into when we go into
40 smaller, outlying communities. We need a meeting for
41 sure for spring. If we're going to think a year in
42 advance, I'd like to suggest that if we can get our plug
43 in early for our fall meetings, our fall meetings always
44 take place after the 30th of September. For much of the
45 Interior, the 30th of September is the end of the hunting
46 season. It's hard to be here even this week because the
47 ground is just starting to freeze, the snow hasn't fallen
48 yet, there's still firewood to get, the animals that
49 you've shot need taken care of and the ditch, if it
50 doesn't get dug in the next week, isn't going to get dug.

00455

1 From my standpoint, October is much better than
2 September. Spring season I have no problem one way or
3 the other. We're dealing with spring first. What is our
4 normal time frame for our spring one? It's in the book
5 back here.

6

7 MS. WILKINSON: Under Tab I.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It starts in February
10 and goes to March.

11

12 MS. WELLS: And Sherry said that March
13 7th through March 17th ADF&G had movies.

14

15 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's the Board of....

16

17 MR. CHURCHILL: Board of Fish?

18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Board of Game.

20

21 MR. CHURCHILL: They may need to be
22 changing that. There may be an entirely new Board of
23 Game by then. I mean in all seriousness. I wouldn't be
24 concerned about those things.

25

26 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Well, the other thing
27 is, in some ways, maybe it wouldn't be bad to be there
28 while it's going on because that would give us the
29 opportunity to testify at the Board of Game and we
30 wouldn't have two expenses of sending somebody there if
31 we wanted to do that or just prior to it. If that's
32 their meeting date, if we can get in, we're going to be
33 handling game, I would think just prior to it and that
34 way if the Chair wants to stay over for the Board of
35 Game, he could.

36

37 MR. KNAUER: 3rd, 4th and 5th then?

38

39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Does that look good to
40 everybody for right now?

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: Sounds good to me.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: 3rd, 4th and 5th of
45 March, Southcentral. Nobody else is on the books yet,
46 right?

47

48 MS. WILKINSON: Well, they are, but not
49 any of the regions we overlap with.

50

00456

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. 3rd, 4th and 5th
2 of March.

3

4 MS. WELLS: In Anchorage then?

5

6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I would say so that time of
7 year.

8

9 MS. WELLS: Is that where ADF&G meets?

10

11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, Board of Game.
12 Okay, Anchorage. 3rd, 4th and 5th of March in Anchorage.
13 I never thought to ask, Ann, is it a problem having it
14 start on a Monday? I think in the past we tried not to
15 have Mondays, but I wasn't sure why.

16

17 MS. WILKINSON: Well, since most of the
18 Staff will be in Anchorage already, then it won't be a
19 problem for the Staff.

20

21 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It would be the fact
22 that we have to travel on Sunday and other people have to
23 travel on Sunday. After looking at it, I'd go for 4th,
24 5th and 6th, better than 3rd, 4th and 5th. That way you
25 can travel on Monday. Bill.

26

27 MR. KNAUER: Some Councils do choose to
28 start their meeting at 1:00 to allow to travel in the
29 morning rather than the night before. Your option.

30

31 MR. CHURCHILL: Why don't we go 4th, 5th
32 and 6th?

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay, 4th, 5th and 6th.
35 That sounds good to me. Now, we've been asked to think
36 about the fall. Let's take a look at it.

37

38 MR. CHURCHILL: 7th, 8th and 9th,
39 thinking with your previous remarks about October.

40

41 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah. I'll leave that
42 up to the rest of you, but I would prefer October. It
43 wouldn't matter which end of October. The 7th, 8th and
44 9th would be fine with me.

45

46 MR. ELVSAAS: I'd like it in the early
47 part of the month. The 7th, 8th and 9th is fine. By the
48 20th, you've got the AFN meetings and all the other
49 meetings.

50

00457

1 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: By the 20th, you've got
2 snow up where I live. I'd just as soon get in and out
3 before the road closes. 7th, 8th and 9th would be fine
4 with me. Do we need to decide at this point in time
5 where? Ann.

6
7 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. It may
8 change, of course. Who knows what may happen between now
9 and a year from now. I would recommend that you make at
10 least a suggestion of where you might meet. I've been
11 getting requests from people in Kenai when are we coming
12 back there.

13
14 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: That's what I was
15 thinking. We've been in this area, we've been in Prince
16 William Sound. It looks to me like it's about time to
17 head for Cook Inlet.

18
19 MR. CHURCHILL: Either Talkeetna, as
20 Susan suggested, or Kenai, either one.

21
22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Oh, Talkeetna. Would
23 there be facilities at Talkeetna?

24
25 MR. CHURCHILL: Some very nice
26 facilities.

27
28 MS. WILKINSON: The CIRI lodge would be
29 closed if they keep with what they're doing this year.
30 They closed it the first of October this year. They're
31 closing for seven months this winter.

32
33 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Is that normal?

34
35 MS. WILKINSON: No, this is the first
36 year they're doing it. That's the largest facility.
37 There's plenty of others in town.

38
39 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: How close is Willow to
40 Talkeetna?

41
42 MS. WILKINSON: Twenty minutes.
43 Actually, longer than that. It's about a half an hour.

44
45 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: About a half an hour.
46 Ann.

47
48 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. Certainly,
49 you can have it wherever you want, but I just would like
50 you to consider that it still isn't on the Kenai

00458

1 Peninsula. The other thing is that having it that
2 distance from Anchorage will mean the Staff will still
3 have to go that distance and stay there, so it would
4 still have a cost.

5
6 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It wouldn't be any gain
7 over the Kenai is what you're saying.

8
9 MS. WILKINSON: Right.

10
11 MS. WELLS: We should be getting the ISER
12 report by next month and that's addressing the rural
13 determination, which is very, very important and a big
14 interest to the people of Kenai. By then they might have
15 some time to digest that and it may be that that's
16 something of great importance.

17
18 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Do we have any rural
19 community on the Kenai that's big enough to hold the
20 meetings at yet close enough so that there's facilities
21 for everybody to stay at?

22
23 MR. CHURCHILL: If you're in Soldotna,
24 aren't you pretty much -- I mean a lot of those
25 communities could easily.

26
27 MS. WELLS: We have a brand-new hotel in
28 Soldotna and then there's hotels in Kenai. Three of
29 them, I think.

30
31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Ann, what were you going
32 to say?

33
34 MS. WILKINSON: I'm sorry, but the
35 question was if there's a rural community in Kenai
36 Peninsula and the only one I've come close to finding is
37 Cooper Landing has a Princess Hotel, but their meeting
38 room is a bit small. I can check into that further, too.

39
40 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There's no requirement
41 that we go to a rural community. We could go to a
42 central community.

43
44 MR. CHURCHILL: And Soldotna is on the
45 road system and easy to get to.

46
47 MR. ELVSAAS: People can access Soldotna
48 easily.

49
50 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Should we put that down

00459

1 as our potential?

2

3 MR. CHURCHILL: Sure.

4

5 MS. WELLS: I'd prefer Kenai. The
6 Soldotna Wildlife Refuge has a pretty nice meeting place.

7

8

9 MR. CHURCHILL: The River Center really
10 has some nice meeting places there in Soldotna that are
11 good parking, easy to access.

12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. Soldotna. That's
14 subject to change and availability, but I think that
15 sounds like a very good place. Now let's go back to
16 everything except adjourn and we're going to see if we
17 can take care of some things in 15 minutes. Did anybody
18 take a look at these different proposals?

19

20 MR. CHURCHILL: No.

21

22 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: The only one I looked at
23 was the Denali wolf buffer zone and I know that that's
24 one the people from -- if Gilbert Dementi was here, we'd
25 definitely speak to it. Mr. Churchill.

26

27 MR. CHURCHILL: I'd be happy to draft a
28 letter on behalf or offer testimony on behalf. There's a
29 lot of information. Contact Gilbert and work with him.
30 I think that more than bears comment based on the
31 testimony that we've had and the input we've had at this
32 meeting.

33

34 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: If it's okay with the
35 rest of the Council, we can direct Bob to write a letter
36 and present. I think he has a pretty good understanding
37 of what our views on it is. I don't even need to have it
38 come back for my signature. We'll trust your ability in
39 that department to present the Council's views in a
40 letter to the Board of Fish.

41

42 MR. CHURCHILL: Board of Game.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Board of Game, I mean.

45

46 MR. CHURCHILL: You were just testing me,
47 I know.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: No, I wasn't testing
50 you. Proposition 210 is on taking big game for religious

00460

1 ceremony. We've addressed that from a subsistence
2 standpoint from the Federal, so it would be pretty easy
3 for them to see what our thoughts on that are. All
4 they'd have to do is look at our actions. Actions speak
5 louder than words. I guess we could direct or you could
6 in your letter direct them to look at the actions we took
7 as a Council on Proposition 210.

8

9 The other one I've got down is Prince
10 William Sound Subsistence Management Plan, method, means,
11 permits, C&T findings. I think that's a little deep for
12 us to head into for today. I don't think that has to be
13 answered at this point in time. It says proposition. I
14 think it's proposal.

15

16 Proposal 398 is on Tyonek clams. We
17 addressed clams and things like that. Let's take a look.
18 It's 398. I'm pretty sure it's on clam digging.
19 Establish subsistence clamming area from one mile north
20 to one mile south of Harriet Point with seasons March
21 15th through September 30th. That's State. I think the
22 only thing we would comment on that is it has been our
23 philosophy that subsistence opportunity needs to be made
24 available to people on the Kenai Peninsula. It's up to
25 them to judge if that's an applicable place or not.
26 That's out of our jurisdiction.

27

28 MR. ELVSAAS: You're saying Point Harriet
29 is out of our jurisdiction?

30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, Point Harriet is
32 out of our jurisdiction.

33

34 MR. ELVSAAS: No, it's not.

35

36 MR. WELLS: It's not Federal.

37

38 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Yeah, it is, because our
39 only jurisdiction is this little chunk of water right
40 there.

41

42 MR. ELVSAAS: But this is Point Harriet.

43

44 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's out of our Federal
45 waters, I guess is a better.....

46

47 MR. ELVSAAS: Oh, I get you. I'm sorry.

48

49 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's in our area, but
50 it's not.....

00461

1 MS. WELLS: But this is a State
2 regulation, so the Board could support it because it is
3 subsistence, correct? I mean this committee could
4 support it because it is subsistence in nature.

5
6 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. If you're
7 having these discussions, please have them on the record
8 so that we'll -- or comments especially to another board,
9 that would be good.

10
11 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Come again, Ann?

12
13 MS. WILKINSON: If you're having this
14 discussion, would you please have it on the record with
15 the microphones on?

16
17 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Okay. The only
18 discussion we were having was whether or not it was in
19 our area to speak to.

20
21 MS. WILKINSON: Oh, okay.

22
23 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: There were a couple
24 other proposals listed here that we might want to take a
25 look at. I think the one 404 is on Copper River
26 dungeness fishery for subsistence. I think that will
27 probably be spoken to by the Copper River Advisory
28 Council. We haven't really looked into that. 22 and 43,
29 I think most of these are probably out of our scope of
30 things that we have discussed in the past, but I'll look
31 through them real quick. Okay, 22 is a proposal that all
32 State subsistence fisheries on the Copper River open at
33 the same time, it's only fair, and that doesn't go along
34 with our idea that we run by biological management, not
35 something like that, so we don't need to speak to that
36 one.

37
38 Number 43, the language in AAC would be
39 repealed and pre-2000 language for the Copper personal
40 dipnet fishery be reinserted and that's by Copper
41 River/Prince William Sound Advisory Committee, Cordova
42 Fishermen's District United, City of Cordova, Eyak
43 Corporation, Tatitlek Corporation and Whittier Advisory
44 Committee. We haven't really dug into that either. I
45 know what that's about. It's about the choice by the
46 Board of Fish to declare the State a subsistence fishery
47 and I know it's objected to quite highly by Copper River
48 Native Association and the Eyak Tribal Council. They
49 support this, but because the State changed the State
50 dipnet fishery into a subsistence fishery and the Federal

00462

1 subsistence users object to that fairly high. I know
2 that. I don't know if we need to speak to that as a
3 Council. So, with that, I think that pretty well takes
4 care of the ones I've got down here. Ann, have you got
5 anything else that's on the table that we've missed?
6

7 MS. WILKINSON: Mr. Chairman. Just one
8 thing about this letter for comments. Mr. Churchill can
9 write the letter, but it needs to come to me. It
10 probably will need your signature on it. I guess as
11 secretary he could as long as we had the.....
12

13 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Now, can't I delegate my
14 authority to the secretary?
15

16 MS. WILKINSON: As long as it's on the
17 record.
18

19 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: I will put it on the
20 record. I will delegate my authority to the secretary to
21 sign this letter to the Board of Fish.
22

23 MR. CHURCHILL: Board of Game.
24

25 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Board of Game. I'll do
26 it to the Board of Fish, too.
27

28 MR. CHURCHILL: There are wolf fish. I
29 know.
30

31 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: Let me see something
32 right here. This is going to take place -- we'll have a
33 chance to talk to these at our spring meeting before the
34 Board of Fish takes actions on these. Wait a second.
35 That's right. This one here is already -- we don't have
36 an opportunity to speak to this one.
37

38 MR. ELVSAAS: We can do this as
39 individuals.
40

41 MS. WELLS: It's October.
42

43 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: We can do this as
44 individuals. You guys might want to take a look at that
45 and see if there's anything in your area that you would
46 like to speak to.
47

48 Now, with that, is there anything else
49 that we've missed, anything we haven't crossed the T's or
50 dotted the I's or people that we've missed? Is there

00463

1 anybody in the audience out there that came to speak that
2 hasn't had an opportunity speak? Is there anybody that
3 wants to hold this meeting up a little longer?

4

5 MR. CHURCHILL: I move we adjourn.

6

7 MS. WELLS: I will second.

8

9 CHAIRMAN LOHSE: It's been moved and
10 seconded. We adjourn. We don't need to take a vote on
11 that. We're adjourned.

12

13 (Off record)

14

15 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

00464

C E R T I F I C A T E

1

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

4

)ss.

5

STATE OF ALASKA)

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for the

8 state of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court

9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10

11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 307 through 463 contain

12 a full, true and correct Transcript of the SOUTHCENTRAL FEDERAL

13 SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING, VOLUME III,

14 taken electronically by Nathaniel Hile on the 4th day of

15 October 2002, beginning at the hour of 8:30 o'clock a.m. at the

16 Masonic Hall in Cordova, Alaska;

17

18 THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript

19 requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by under

20 my direction and reduced to print to the best of our knowledge

21 and ability;

22

23 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested

24 in any way in this action.

25

26 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 18th day of October 2002.

27

28

29

30

31

Joseph P. Kolasinski

32

Notary Public in and for Alaska

33

My Commission Expires: 04/17/04